- DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 377 552 EA 026 314

AUTHOR	Keefe, James W.; And Others
TITLE	Leadership in Middle Level Education. Volume II: Leadership in Successfully Restructuring Middle Level Schools.
INSTITUTION	National Association of Secondary School Principals, Reston, Va.
REPORT NO	ISBN-088210-293-1
PUB DATE	94
NOTE	165p.; For Volume I, see ED 356 535.
AVAILABLE FROM	National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1904 Association Drive, Reston, VA 22091-1537.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Books (010)
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	*Educational Change; Intermediate Grades; Junior High Schools; *Leadership; *Middle Schools; Outcomes of Education; Program Implementation; School Effectiveness; *School Restructuring

ABSTRACT

This book presents findings of the second phase of a study conducted by the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP). Specifically, the study sought to identify the educational programs and leadership practices that were used in successfully restructuring middle schools. Of 46 principals at middle schools that met the NASSP's nominating criteria, 39 completed a survey about their schools' leadership and programs. The principals, all teachers, and 20 percent of the student body completed surveys at 25 of the 39 schools. Eight of the 25 schools were selected for site visits. Following the introduction, the first chapter details the leadership and program characteristics of successfully restructuring schools, and chapter 2 provides brief profiles of each of the eight selected schools. Chapters 3-6 present qualitative information about the visions of middle level education, educational assumptions, student outcomes, and the restructuring process. Some of the findings include: (1) schools are slow to change, particularly if the changes affect many parts of the system; (2) restructuring initiatives must be tailored to the individual school; (3) school administrators and staff generally lack the experience and expertise to manage systemic change efforts that include a school-design statement and a comprehensive change plan; (4) middle-level schools in the United States are committed to systemic, student-centered restructuring; (5) leadership is crucial for success; and (6) coordination among various levels of the system is necessary. One table and 14 figures are included. Appendices contain samples of the nomination materials, previsit data-collection instruments, selected survey data, site-visit materials, and site-visit data-collection instruments. (LMI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 377 552

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN **OTHER THAN PAPER COPY** HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
T. Koerner
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Leadership in Middle Level Education

Volume II:

Leadership in Successfully Restructuring Middle Level Schools

James W. Keefe
Jerry Valentine
Donald C. Clark
Judith L. Irvin

EA 026 314

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

National Association of Secondary School Principals

EA

Leadership in Middle Level Education

Volume II: Leadership in Successfully Restructuring Middle Level Schools

■ James W. Keefe ■ Jerry Valentine ■
■ Donald C. Clark ■ Judith L. Irvin ■

About the Authors

Donald C. Clark is professor of secondary education, University of Arizona, Tucson

Judith L. Irvin is professor of middle level education, Florida State University, Tallahassee

James W. Keefe is director of research, National Association of Secondary School Principals

Jerry Valentine is professor of educational administration, College of Education, University of Missouri, Columbia

ISBN 088210-293-1
Copyright NASSP, 1994

National Association of Secondary School Principals
1904 Association Drive, Reston, Virginia 22091-1537

Executive Director: Timothy J. Dyer
Director of Research: James W. Keefe
Director of Publications: Robert Mahaffey
Editor: Patricia George
Design: Lori Price Gould

Contents

Tables & Figures	v
Foreword	vii
Introduction	ix
Chapter 1—Leadership and Program Characteristics of Successfully Restructuring Schools	1
Chapter 2—School Profiles	12
Chapter 3—Visions of Middle Level Education	16
Chapter 4—Philosophical, Psychological, and Organizational Assumptions	36
Chapter 5—Desired Student Outcomes for Restructuring	43
Chapter 6—Processes for Developmentally Appropriate Restructuring	48
Chapter 7—Status of Middle Level Restructuring	59
References	67
Appendices:—Forms, Instrumentation, Selected Data	68

Advisory Committee

James Anding, principal, Omaha, NE

James Aseltine, principal, Farmington, CT

Don Dalton, principal, Austin, TX

Marion Payne, principal, Columbia, MD

Lori Simmons, vice principal, Seattle, WA

Joseph Tafoya, assistant superintendent, Santa Ana, CA

Sue Carol Thompson, middle school director, Overland Park, KS

Research Team for the Study

Jerry Valentine, Chairman, University of Missouri, Columbia

Donald C. Clark, University of Arizona

Judith L. Irvin, Florida State University, Tallahassee

James W. Keefe, NASSP Director of Research

George Melton, NASSP Deputy Executive Director Emeritus

Tables & Figures

1.1	Site-Visit CASE-IMS Data (Selected)	10
3.1	Personal Visions of Middle Level Education	18
3.2	Current Mission Statements—School Design Statements	21
3.3	Visions That Informed the Schools Five Years Ago—Leadership Teams	23
3.4	Visions That Informed the Schools Five Years Ago—Teacher Groups	24
3.5	Anticipated Visions of Five Years into the Future	26
3.6	Factors Influencing Vision Development Five Years Ago	27
3.7	Factors Influencing Vision Development—Current School Visions	28
3.8	Evidence of Administrator and Teacher Support	31
3.9	Student Descriptions of "What Is Best About Their Schools"	34
5.1	Desired Student Outcomes—School Design Statements	44
6.1	Processes Used To Achieve Developmentally Appropriate Restructuring—School Design Statements	50
6.2	Processes Used To Achieve Developmentally Appropriate Restructuring—Leadership Teams and Teacher Groups	52
6.3	Strategies for Implementation—Systematic Procedures	55
6.4	Evidence of Successful Restructuring	57

Foreword

School restructuring is a question of design. Design is a relatively straightforward, if challenging, process in a new school. But the leadership team in an existing school faces a dual challenge—maintaining the old while implementing the new. This is a matter of redesign, not simple design. All the schools in this second phase of NASSP's national study of Leadership in Middle Level Education are engaged in redesign. The results to date are encouraging but by no means definitive.

This study used some of the most sophisticated technology available today to collect and profile important information about successfully restructuring middle level schools. Participating schools were asked to collect data about 34 significant school inputs and outcomes using NASSP's Comprehensive Assessment of School Environments Information Management System (CASE-IMS). These data provided diagnostic profiles for the research team to use in selecting the most appropriate schools for the study. The profiles were also used to examine various aspects of school restructuring. Later, each school chosen for a site visit was asked to prepare an NASSP School Design Statement, a systematic analysis of the school's restructuring plans. All these data enabled the research team to conduct a carefully defined investigation.

The findings and conclusions of this study are important to understanding the course of restructuring in contemporary middle level schools. Extensive findings have been gathered on the nature of program and leader characteristics in the schools, their relationship with national sample and normative data, and current trends in restructuring. Significant conclusions about the change process and school restructuring have been formulated. The latter include the difficulty of comprehensive and systematic change, its unique progress in each school, the

general acceptance of the Carnegie/NASSP/NMSA "middle level model," its uneven implementation, and the central position of principals and school leadership teams in the process.

The NASSP extends a sincere thank-you to the principals and schools of the restructuring sample and particularly to the site-visit schools. The real work of restructuring is taking place in these and other buildings. We also extend our gratitude to the members of the research and site-visit teams, with special recognition to Jerry Valentine for his committed leadership. Betty Hill ably managed the word processing.

Restructuring in middle level schools is a work-in-progress. Let us hope that the next NASSP study of this important level of education, to be conducted in the early years of the 21st century, will find real progress has been made. Students, of course, will be the principal beneficiaries.

James W. Keefe
NASSP Director of Research

Introduction

The concept of a "middle level of education" emerged in the past decade as a distinct entity in education, meriting equal attention with the traditional high school and elementary designations. States are increasingly certifying middle level teachers and principals for their roles in the K–12 education of students (Valentine and Mogar, 1992). National and state professional education associations, including NASSP and its state affiliates, have experienced a significant increase in members who have specific preparation and interest in the middle level. The term "middle level," first popularized in NASSP's comprehensive 1981 study of the principalship (Valentine et al., 1981), is now commonly used to describe the educational programs and practices designed for students of the pre and early adolescent years, typically grades 5 through 9 (Clark and Clark, in press).

Historically, NASSP has demonstrated commitment to research that helps define current practice and future trends in middle level education. In the mid-1960s, NASSP sponsored the first comprehensive study of the junior high principalship (Rock and Hemphill, 1966). With funding from the Geraldine R. Dodge Foundation, the Association next conducted a major study of middle level principals and programs from 1979 through 1983. The study included a national survey, reported in 1981 as *The Middle Level Principalship, Volume 1: A Survey of Middle Level Principals and Programs* (Valentine et al., 1981). A second and unique phase was the selection and study of 50 "effective" principals and their schools. Part II of the study was published as *The Middle Level Principalship, Volume II: The Effective Middle Level Principal* (Keefe et al., 1983).

In late 1990, the Association again mounted a comprehensive study of middle level leaders and schools. The study was designed to address middle level program and leadership issues for the 1990s and into the next century. Six research questions were prepared for investigation:

- Are there differences in the preparation and beliefs of middle level principals, assistant principals, and members of school leadership teams—the persons who will guide the schools into the next century?
- Is the leadership of today's middle level schools different from that described in NASSP's 1981 and 1966 studies?
- Has the concept of a "leadership team" emerged in middle level schools?
- What are the beliefs of middle level educators about specific educational programs, and are the programs in middle level schools congruent with those beliefs?
- Are the programs in today's middle level schools different from those reported in previous studies?
- What are the practices used in schools experiencing successful restructuring of their middle level programs?

To answer these types of questions, the research team proposed seven specific objectives for the study:

1. Develop a base of knowledge about middle level principals, assistant principals, and leadership team members, including personal characteristics, job roles and tasks, and professional beliefs.
2. Describe similarities and differences among these three groups of middle level leaders.
3. Develop a base of knowledge about middle level programs and instructional practices.
4. Describe similarities and differences of middle level programs and instructional practices based on grade level organizational structure and other demographic data.
5. Describe programs and leaders in schools that are restructuring successfully.
6. Contrast the programs and leadership of successful restructuring schools with those of the typical random sample of middle level schools.
7. Identify trends in middle level education and leadership that will assist educators in the implementation of quality middle level schools for the next century.

The study was again completed in two major phases. The first phase was concluded in 1992 and released in early 1993 as *Leadership in Middle Level Education, Volume 1: A National Survey of Middle Level Leaders and Schools* (Valentine et al., 1993). These survey data represented a stratified random sample of the more than 12,000 middle level schools across the United States. Like its predecessors in 1966 and 1981, the first phase report provided the most comprehensive view to date of the leadership, programs, and trends in middle level education.

This current report presents the findings from the second phase of the study. The focus of this report is the final three research issues previously listed, and in particular, the last: "What are the practices used in schools experiencing successful restructuring of their middle level programs?"

Principal/School Selection Process

To identify practices used in successfully restructuring middle level schools, the research team developed a nomination form with specific criteria associated with the current restructuring

movement. The Nomination Form (Appendix A) was mailed to persons who were judged to be most knowledgeable about the middle level principals and programs in their respective states. Nominators included principal association leaders, state departments of education staff members, non-public educational organization leaders, and university professors. Each respondent was asked to review the nomination criteria listed on the form and to identify and rate a principal or principals who exemplified those criteria.

NASSP staff members reviewed the more than 50 nominations to verify that each nominated school had met the middle level definition and that the nominated principal was still at the school. The research team then reviewed the nominations, ratings, and comments to determine that the nomination criteria had been properly interpreted and applied by the nominators. Fifty-four principals and schools were contacted in the summer of 1992 and asked to participate. Of these, 39 agreed to proceed with the complex process of data collection. Twenty-five schools completed the entire data collection process and constituted the formal sample of successfully restructuring schools.

To identify a smaller sample for study in detail, the research team analyzed the responses to a Principal Survey completed by the entire sample (Appendix B). This survey included questions about school leadership and programs derived from key items of the Phase I national random survey of principals. School input, climate, and outcomes data from the NASSP Comprehensive Assessment of School Environments Information Management System (CASE-IMS) battery of surveys were also analyzed to identify schools worthy of on-site visits. (Appendix B provides a description of the CASE-IMS variables.) From the initial group of 25 successfully restructuring schools, 8 were selected for on-site visits.

Description of the Schools

The 25 successfully restructuring schools and their principals were generally representative of the organizational grade patterns, student enrollments, community populations, and geographic regions of middle level schools across the country. Selected demographic characteristics of the 8 schools selected for on-site visits, for the other 17 schools that formed the total restructuring sample, and for the 570 schools of the national stratified random sample from Phase I of the study (1992) can be found in Appendix C. Throughout this report, these three groups are referred to as "site-visit schools" ($n = 8$), restructuring group ($n = 25$), and national random sample ($n = 570$).

Grade organizational patterns are similar across these three samples. Sixty-three percent of the site-visit sample and 60 percent of the restructuring sample were 6–7–8 schools; 50 percent of the schools in the national random sample were 6–8 schools. The 7–8 and 7–8–9 percentages were even more closely parallel.

The patterns for student enrollment and community population were comparably distributed in site-visit and restructuring schools and representative of the random sample. Geographic representation was particularly well-distributed across the nation for both restructuring and site-visit samples.

It is interesting to compare the similarities and differences of the 25 restructuring schools and the 8 site-visit schools with the national random sample, but it is important to note that these characteristics were not selection criteria for the inclusion of schools in this study. Selection was

based primarily on the strength of the nomination form, data from the principal survey form, and the CASE-IMS profiles. When school nomination ratings and CASE-IMS profiles were comparable, demographic variables were considered. The research team set as an objective to select site-visit schools that represented different programs, grade patterns, enrollments, community types, and regions, as well as varied CASE-IMS profiles. Appendix C-1 provides details about selected characteristics of the 25 restructuring schools.

Data Collection Process

In August 1992, 54 principals meeting the nomination criteria were contacted by letter and asked to participate in the study. Of that group, 46 agreed to participate. These principals were asked in late 1992 to complete a survey about their schools' leadership and programs (Appendix B). Thirty-nine administrators completed this Principal Survey. The 39 principals were mailed copies of NASSP's Comprehensive Assessment of School Environments (CASE) surveys to administer to all teachers and 20 percent of their students. The teacher battery included a School Climate Survey (55 items), a Teacher Satisfaction Survey (56 items), and teacher efficacy scales (9 items). The students completed a School Climate Survey (55 items), a Student Satisfaction Survey (46 items), and a student efficacy scale (8 items). The principals were asked to complete a 98-item questionnaire and return all completed answer sheets for scoring to the CASE-IMS Scoring Services Center at Western Michigan University in Kalamazoo. Twenty-five schools completed the CASE-IMS battery by January 1993. These 25 schools became the primary restructuring study sample.

In January 1993, the research team reviewed all the data for the 25 schools and selected 8 schools for site visits. In February, the principals of the eight schools were contacted by letter (Appendix D) and asked to participate in the site-visit portion of the study. Each accepted and was mailed a NASSP School Design Statement Form (Appendix D) for summarizing school initiatives on key components of school restructuring. The form, based on the restructuring research of Howard and Keefe (1992–93), is structured to elicit information about the school mission; the philosophical, psychological, and organizational assumptions of the school; desired student outcomes; and eight school system components. Completed Design Statements were available to site-visit teams prior to each visit.

The site visits were conducted during April and May 1993 by two-person teams composed of one research team member and another educator, typically a school principal. Each site visit lasted three days. During the first day, the visiting team toured the school facility and reviewed its historical background, its schedule, instructional programs, and recent efforts in restructuring. The visiting team discussed the Design Statement and the CASE-IMS profile with the school leadership team and reviewed the schedule of events for the three-day visit.

During the actual school day, the visiting team observed classrooms and took notes about observed teaching strategies and methods. Teachers who were formally observed were asked to complete a short follow-up form about their curriculum and programs. At the end of the first day, the visiting team conducted a structured group interview with the school's leadership team.

The second day included a structured group interview with representative students (selected by the research team), a shadow study of a randomly selected student, additional classroom observations, and a structured group interview with selected faculty members (again chosen by the research team).

The final day included additional classroom observations, discussions with school staff members and students, visits with local media, preliminary written documentation of the visit, and an exit interview with the principal. Appendix D includes a schedule of activities for the site visits and the names and positions of the team members who visited each school. Copies of on-site data collection forms and the directions for the selection of persons to be interviewed, observed, and shadowed may be found in Appendix E.

Organization of the Report

This report provides insight about the educational programs and practices used in successfully restructuring middle level schools. Leadership and program characteristics of the eight site-visit schools are presented in the first chapter. Chapter 2 provides short profiles of each school visited. Rich qualitative and anecdotal information about school visions, educational assumptions, student outcomes, and the restructuring process are presented in chapters 3–6. The final chapter summarizes the most significant findings and offers a composite profile of successfully restructuring middle level schools.

Chapter 1

Leadership and Program Characteristics of Successfully Restructuring Schools

For years, middle level schooling has been synonymous with change. Massive transitions from 7–8–9 to 6–7–8 grade patterns and from content-centered to student-centered practices have been continual in recent years. This press for change and refinement of roles and programs may have been a mixed blessing, with increased receptivity to restructuring accompanied by increasing fatigue with change.

Change and restructuring are not synonymous. Restructuring implies more than change; it implies a type of change—a positive, purposeful evolution constructed from an ever-maturing vision of what is good middle level education. Changes occur and become past tense. Restructuring is continuous and future-oriented. For example, a school that has implemented interdisciplinary teaming has certainly changed, but the change may not be a restructuring process that fundamentally alters the way the school delivers curriculum or instruction.

The first section of this chapter provides comprehensive data about eight restructuring middle level schools that were selected for site visits. Included are the personal and professional characteristics of principals, their leadership practices, the communities where their schools are located, their educational programs, principals' beliefs about middle level trends and issues, and data from NASSP's Comprehensive Assessment of School Environments Information Management System (CASE-IMS). The descriptive information presented in this chapter provides perspective for important discussions about the school profiles, visions, assumptions, outcomes, and restructuring processes presented in Chapters 2 through 6.

Leader and School Characteristics

❑ Principals

Of the eight site-visit school principals, four were women, four men. The principals were younger and had begun their principalship careers at an earlier age than is typical of principals across the country. Two were appointed to their first principalship in

their late 20s, four during their 30s, and two during their early 40s. Five of the eight had been principals in their current schools for eight years or fewer. Two of these were in the second year at their current school. Five had been principals for fewer than 10 years and all had spent fewer than 15 years in the classroom.

The principals all had advanced educational preparation. Two had doctorates; all had a master's degree, and all but one had done graduate work beyond the master's. Four of the principals described their administrative certifications as K–12, two as secondary, and two as elementary. None had "middle level" certification, a relatively new area of certification available in at least 10 states (Valentine and Mogar, 1992). Not surprisingly, the principals were relatively content with their career positions. Six wanted to remain in their present positions for the next three to five years; one would like a central office position other than the superintendency; and one would like a middle level position in a different school. None of this very talented group of principals selected the superintendency or the professoriate as career goals in the next five years. This reinforces a growing concern about the talent pool for these two critical positions as identified in the National Survey of Middle Level Leaders and Schools (Valentine et al., 1993).

❑ Schools and Communities

The eight middle level schools in this study were all public institutions, with varying student enrollments. Five of the schools had 6–7–8 grade patterns; two were 7–8 schools; and one, a 7–8–9 school, was scheduled to change in the next two years.

Typical of middle level education, the majority of teachers in each school were female. Six of the principals indicated that the majority of teachers held secondary teacher certification. Two principals of 6–7–8 schools said most of their teachers had middle level certification.

The communities in which the eight schools were located were a representative cross-section of the country. Two schools were in cities of more than 150,000 people, three in suburban communities related to large cities, and one in a city of approximately 80,000. One school was in a community of fewer than 25,000 people, and one in a town of fewer than 5,000. The schools were also evenly distributed across the geographic regions of the country, with the following states represented: Arizona, Missouri, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Texas, Vermont, and Wyoming.

Comparative information about these four school and community variables for the 8 site-visit schools, the group of 25 restructuring schools, and the 1992 national random sample is provided in Appendix C.

❑ Leadership Practices

Each principal was asked to indicate whether a leadership team was operational in the school. The following definition was given as the basis for response:

- A leadership team is a group of teachers and administrators designated by the principal or elected by the faculty to assist in the leadership operation of the school. These staff members may have been formally designated, or they may be a more informal group obviously instrumental in the ongoing operation of the school.

Principals in six of the eight schools reported that they had leadership teams of seven or more staff members. The smallest school in the study, with an enrollment of fewer than 200, had a leadership team of three. One school did not have a leadership team.

Principals were asked about the level of involvement for various individuals or groups in decision-making processes on nine typical building-level issues. The choices for degree of involvement were "no involvement," "involved in discussions," "make recommendations," and "make decision." The individuals or groups in question were principal, assistant principal, leadership team, team leaders/department chairs, staff committee, faculty as a whole, individual teachers, students, parents/community, central office, and school board.

The nine building-level issues included:

1. Adding a new course or instructional program
2. Adopting rules for student behavior
3. Curricular reform
4. Developing a budget for your school
5. Evaluating teaching staff
6. Evaluating the school's grading practices
7. Formulating school goals and mission
8. Hiring teaching staff
9. Determining school organization as teams, departments, etc.

In all eight schools, decisions regarding at least one of the nine building-level issues were made *jointly* by the principal and one or more of the faculty groups. In four schools, the principal and one or more faculty groups made joint decisions about at least five of the nine issues.

"Formulating school goals and mission" was the only issue for which one or more faculty groups was involved in every school. "Adopting rules for student behavior" was decided by at least one or more faculty groups in seven of the schools. None of the schools involved faculty members in decisions about "evaluating teaching staff."

The faculty groups most active in decision making in the eight schools were, in order of frequency, leadership teams, faculty as a whole team, team leaders/department chairs, and staff committees. "Faculty as a whole" may be misleading in this context because it was mentioned consistently by the two smallest schools, but seldom by the six larger schools.

Clearly, leadership teams were directly involved in making decisions in seven schools. However, each decision was made *jointly* with the principal. In five schools, team leaders/department chairs were decisionmakers, but in each instance the decisions were made *jointly* with the principal. The same was true for all decisions made by staff committees. No pattern of independent decision making by faculty members emerged.

The faculty as a whole was the only teacher decision-making group reported as not requiring joint decisions with the principal. This occurred three times among the 31 issues decided by one or more faculty groups. In the smallest school, the faculty decided about school behavior rules and school goals/mission. In another relatively small school, faculty members decided independently about school goals/missions.

One or more faculty groups was involved in *making recommendations* about the nine building-level issues almost two and one-half times as frequently as they were involved in *making the decisions*. One or more faculty groups in at least one of the schools made recommendations or decisions for each issue. As in decision making, the only issue with no faculty involvement was evaluating the teaching staff.

Site-based management practices stress the movement of decisions to the building level, just as participative management practices stress the movement of decision making from the principal's office to the faculty. Principals were asked four questions about their level of autonomy at the school. Two of the questions investigating staffing issues and two, budgetary issues.

Staffing. Six of the eight principals filled teacher vacancies by selecting the individuals they wanted; central office simply endorsed the selections. One principal made the selections within options set by the central office. The central office actually selected the teachers for one school. Six of the eight principals had some authority to make alternative personnel decisions such as employing two or three teacher aides instead of one teacher. Two principals did not have that authority.

Budgeting. Five of the eight principals described the extent to which they participated in the determination of their school's budget allocation as moderate or high. In only one school did the principal not participate in determining building budget allocations. All the principals indicated that they had at least some autonomy or latitude in determining how discretionary monies for the building level would be spent.

Parent Involvement. Parents were actively involved in all the study schools, both in a *planning/advising* capacity and in the *operation* of the schools. Each principal involved parents in planning/advising for school objectives and priorities and for finance and fund raising. Seven principals involved parents in planning/advising for program changes and new programs being considered. Six principals included parents in planning/advising for student activities and for issues of student behavior, student rights, and student responsibilities. Each principal used parents in the operation of their student activities programs—as resource persons for programs and activities—as well as in instruction. Most of the schools also used parents as volunteer aides, tutors, sponsors of student groups, and operators of concessions that benefited the school.

❑ Educational Programs

Scheduling. A variety of terms can be used to describe a school's academic schedule (e.g., block, flexible, modular), but most schedules can be characterized by the number of periods in the school day. Five of the study schools had seven-period days, two had eight-period days, and one had a variable number of periods determined by individual teacher teams. Period length was 40–45 minutes in four of the schools, 46–50 minutes in three schools, and variable in the school where teams determined the schedule. The classroom teacher-to-pupil ratio in four of the schools was 1:26–29; in three schools 1:21–25; and in one school 1:16–20.

Teaming. Interdisciplinary teaming has become a fixture in the organizational structure of middle level education. During the past decade—especially in the past four years—use of teaming has increased rapidly. In 1981, teaming was a very distant second behind departmentalized

instruction as the primary instructional delivery system for basic courses in middle level education (Valentine et al., 1981). By 1989, 33 percent of middle level schools teamed (Alexander and McEwin, 1989); by 1990, the incidence was 40 percent (Epstein and Mac Iver, 1990). Fifty-seven percent of the middle level schools used teaming in 1992 (Valentine et al., 1993). Six of the eight site-visit schools used teaming—typically four and five-person teams to teach math, science, social science, English/language arts, and reading. Five of these six reported having common planning periods and individual planning periods for all team members. Each of the six schools assigned students to teams heterogeneously, with students taught only by team members for teaming subjects. The percentage of site-visit schools implementing these teaming practices was well above national averages.

Each of the six schools used a designated "team leader." Half provided monetary compensation for the role, but none provided released time. Half rotated the leader role among team members. In three schools, the administration appointed the team leader; in another three, team members selected the leader. Except for released time, the percentages on each of the team-leader issues for these restructuring schools again were well above national norms (Valentine et al., 1993).

> ...these eight schools had significantly higher rates of implementation of teaming, exploration, and cocurricular practices and plans to implement these characteristics than is typical of schools across the country.

Teachers were assigned to their respective teams by the administration in one school; the teachers selected their own teams in another. In the remaining four schools, the administration appointed the teams after input from the teachers.

Grading. Grade reporting practices have been a major issue of discussion in middle level programming for many years. Educators have continued to look for strategies that accurately depict student ability and progress, that motivate students, match contemporary instructional practice, and meet an ever-increasing need for authenticity. In the site-visit schools, a wide variety of grade reporting procedures were used, including letter scale; word scale such as excellent, good, etc.; number scale such as 1–5; satisfactory-unsatisfactory, pass-fail; informal written notes; percentage ratings; and progress in relation to potential.

Six of the schools used multiple procedures, most commonly a letter, word, or number scale with written notes/explanations. Two schools used progress in relation to potential in combination with other procedures.

Grouping. In recent years, ability grouping has been closely scrutinized across all levels of education. The general consensus among educational researchers and scholars is that grouping by ability has mixed effects upon students. The general practice throughout middle level education, however, has been to use ability grouping.

In 1992, ability grouping was practiced in 82 percent of middle level schools, with 69 percent assigning students to specific classes by ability and 13 percent grouping students by ability within classes after they had been assigned heterogeneously (Valentine et al., 1993).

Of the eight schools in this study, five assigned students into specific classes by ability, one grouped them by ability within classes after assignment, and two did not use ability grouping. Four of the six that currently group are studying the issue and are considering eliminating their grouping practices. None of the six schools with grouping said they will be eliminating it within the year. In the main, site-visit schools were very similar to the national random sample in their struggle with the issue of ability grouping.

❑ Issues and Trends

The eight principals were asked to respond to several questions about educational issues and trends. Their responses are reported in this section.

Grade structure. Principals were asked about the ideal grade organizational structure for a middle level school. All principals selected the 6–7–8 grade pattern. Of the eight schools, five currently have a 6–7–8 pattern. When principals were asked why their school system changed to that grade pattern, each reported that the changes "provide a better transition from elementary to high school," and "provide a program best suited to the needs of the middle level age student." Four also chose to "employ new curriculum or instructional innovations" and three selected to "employ ideas or programs successfully implemented in other schools." Only two reported to "adjust to enrollment trends," "solve concerns about a junior high program," and "move ninth graders into high school program."

These reasons for moving to a "middle school" were almost identical to those of middle level principals across the country in the 1992 national survey (Valentine et al., 1993).

Enrollment. The responses of the principals regarding optimum enrollment for a middle level school were curiously distributed. Two principals favored an enrollment of 200–399, two chose 400–599, two chose 600–799, and two chose 800–999.

Program Practices. The principals were asked to describe the degree to which they supported five commonly-endorsed middle level program practices. All principals indicated that teaming, exploratory courses, and cocurricular programs were important. Seven said that adviser-advisee and intramural activities were important.

Each principal was also asked about the current level or future plans for implementation of these five practices. Four said they had implemented teaming fully, two planned implementation, and two were considering full implementation in the next two years. Six schools had implemented exploratory courses and two were considering implementation within two years. Three already had adviser-advisee programs, one planned to implement these programs in two years, and one was considering implementation. Three had no plans for implementation in the near future. Five of the schools had cocurricular programs, one was considering implementation in two years, and two do not plan to implement. Two schools had intramural programs for all students during or immediately after the regular school day. Two schools planned implementation within two years, one was considering implementation, and three had no plans for implementation.

Often, when principals described their schools as not "fully" implementing some practice, they had implemented it to some degree. And when they said they did not plan to implement a practice, they were sometimes implying that they would continue with *partial* implementation. From an overall perspective, these eight schools had significantly higher rates of implementation of teaming, exploration, and cocurricular practices and plans to implement these characteristics than is typical of schools across the country. On the other hand, the site-visit schools were much like other schools in their implementation of adviser-advisee and intramural programs (Valentine et al., 1993).

Technology. Each of the schools used educational technology to some degree. Four schools had educational television, three used computer-assisted instruction, two had interactive (within school) video and computer managed instruction, one reported using distance education, and another reported interactive (remote access) video. These levels of use were generally representative of those reported by all middle level schools in 1992 (Valentine et al., 1993).

From an overall perspective, these eight schools had significantly higher rates of implementation of teaming, exploration, and cocurricular practices and plans to implement these characteristics than is typical of schools across the country.

Intramural Programs. The site-visit principals were very similar to principals across the country in their beliefs about intramural programs vs. interscholastic athletics. Of the eight principals, three said intramurals should be emphasized over interscholastics at all middle level grades (5–9). One principal said intramurals should be emphasized at grade 8 and below, two said at grade 7 and below, and one said they should be stressed at grade 6 and below.

Ability Grouping. Principals' opinions about ability grouping were also similar to the national sample. Six endorsed some form of grouping by ability, three opted for grouping "into certain classes" as appropriate, and three endorsed "grouping for instruction within a class."

Teacher Skills and Characteristics. Principals' descriptions of the most important skills and characteristics of excellent middle level teachers were typical of the national sample. Rated most important were "adjusting instruction to the varying learning styles and skills of students," "using varied and developmentally appropriate methods of instruction," and "developing positive relationships with students in the classroom."

Tasks of Schools. Principals' choices for the most important tasks of American schools were also typical of the larger sample. Acquisition of basic skills was rated first, followed in order by development of skills and practice in critical intellectual inquiry and problem solving, development of positive self-concept and good human relations, and development of skills to function in a technological society.

❑ CASE-IMS Data

The NASSP Comprehensive Assessment of School Environments Information Management System (CASE-IMS) is a total school profiling and planning system. Development of the system began in 1982 with the creation of an NASSP Task Force on Effective School Climate. The Task Force, chaired by Edgar A. Kelley and directed by NASSP director of research James W. Keefe, formulated an interactive Model of the School Environment. The model describes schooling in the context of:

- District and community characteristics
- School inputs such as goals/objectives, organizational characteristics, and group/individual characteristics
- Mediating variables such as climate and satisfaction
- Student outcomes of satisfaction and productivity.

Thirty-four variables are generated from data collected through seven CASE surveys. For this study, only six surveys were used; the optional Parent Survey was omitted.

1. Principal Questionnaire—This 98-item questionnaire is completed by the principal and/or administrative staff member to provide schoolwide contextual data on such variables as enrollment, community characteristics, student demographics, curricular components, fiscal support, and student performance on standardized tests. Principals are asked to rate the school on teacher autonomy, budgeting practices, administrative performance, attitude toward change, and the relative priority of 14 common educational goals.

2. Teacher Report Form—This 23-item report is completed by teachers who rate three areas also included in the Principal Questionnaire: educational goals, teacher autonomy, and teacher participation in decision making.

3. Student Report Form—This eight-item survey of students assesses general student efficacy, the student's perception of how effective he/she is in academic tasks.

4. Teacher Satisfaction Survey—This 56-item teacher survey provides an overall satisfaction score and specific satisfaction scores on nine dimensions: (1) administration, (2) compensation, (3) opportunities for advancement, (4) student responsibility and discipline, (5) curriculum and job tasks, (6) co-workers, (7) parent and community, (8) school buildings, supplies, and maintenance, and (9) communication.

5. Student Satisfaction Survey—This 46-item student survey provides an overall satisfaction score and specific satisfaction scores on eight dimensions: (1) teachers; (2) fellow students; (3) schoolwork; (4) student activities; (5) student discipline; (6) decision-making opportunities; (7) school buildings, supplies, and upkeep; and (8) communication.

6. School Climate Survey—This 55-item survey of teachers, students, and (if desired) parents, asks respondents to describe how they think most people feel about the organization. The survey provides information about 10 dimensions: (1) teacher-student relations, (2) security and maintenance, (3) administration, (4) student academic orientation, (5) student behavioral values, (6) guidance, (7) student-peer relationships, (8) parent and community-school relationships, (9) instructional management, and (10) student activities.

In the selection of the eight site-visit schools, 14 of the 34 CASE-IMS variables were considered to be of particular interest because of their conceptual relationship to restructuring. The following variables were considered in depth by the research team:

1. Difficulty of Introducing Change
2. School's Administrative Team Performance
3. Importance of 14 Selected School Goals
4. Teacher Satisfaction
5. Teacher Perceptions of Autonomy
6. Teacher Perceptions of Participation
7. Teacher Climate
8. Student Climate
9. Total Student Achievement
10. Percent of Students Receiving Disciplinary Referrals
11. Percentage of Students Passing All Courses
12. Student Satisfaction
13. Student Self-Efficacy
14. Proportion of Students Completing the School Year.

Scores on these 14 variables for each of the eight site-visit schools are presented in Table 1.1. The CASE-IMS national norms are also listed in the table. For all but four of the variables, the higher the score, the more positive the responses.

Four variables are reversed-scored: Importance of School Goals (variable 3), Teacher Perceptions of Autonomy (variable 5), Percentage of Students Receiving Disciplinary Referrals (variable 10), and Student Self-Efficacy (variable 13). The *lower* the score on these variables, the more positive the responses. Definitions for each variable are presented in Appendix B. The scores for the total group of 25 restructuring schools may be found in Appendix C.

The average scores of the eight schools generally exceeded the national norms. On 11 of the 14 variables, site sample averages bettered national norms. Of the three remaining variables, the most relevant to this study on restructuring was "the difficulty of introducing change." Five of the eight schools were slightly below norm and three slightly above norm, making the composite picture fairly typical of schools across the country. These successfully restructuring schools reflected the same attitudes and conditions that make change difficult in all schools. They were able to overcome these preexisting tendencies through staff solidarity.

The high level of agreement between principals and teachers regarding the importance of selected school goals clearly defines these eight schools. Against a national norm of 5.18, the site-visit schools averaged 1.66 on a scale in which a lower score indicates greater consistency. Seven of the eight schools were extraordinarily successful in achieving agreement on this critical variable.

Teachers' perceptions about their schools were also very positive, with high scores on "perceived level of teacher autonomy" and "participation in decision making." Teachers were person-

ally very satisfied with their own situations in the schools (teacher satisfaction) and perceived others' views of their schools as positive (teacher climate).

Students were very positive about their schools. Both student satisfaction and student climate scores were close to national norms. Students' beliefs in their personal ability to be successful in school (student self-efficacy), as well as their achievement data were all above national norms.

TABLE 1.1

Site-Visit CASE-IMS Data (Selected)

Climate Variable	Metro Academy	Mountain View MS	Southland MS	Desert View MS	Maple Grove MS	Heartland JrHS	Lone Star MS	Pacific MS	Average	National Norm
Change Difficulty	2.87	2.87	3.20	2.93	2.87	3.20	3.20	2.80	2.99	3.06
Admin. Team	3.64	3.18	4.00	4.27	4.00	4.64	4.13	3.55	3.93	3.73
School Goals*	3.60	0.57	1.18	2.21	1.59	1.12	1.28	1.72	1.66	5.18
Teacher Satisfaction	3.58	4.06	3.32	3.27	3.98	3.57	3.74	3.56	3.63	3.23
Perceived Autonomy *	0.63	0.68	1.76	0.64	1.12	1.29	1.11	1.02	1.03	1.37
Perceived Participation	1.32	1.43	0.57	1.68	1.68	1.34	1.29	1.38	1.34	0.85
Teacher Climate	**	4.18	3.59	3.84	4.01	3.76	4.06	3.98	3.92	3.64
Student Climate	**	4.10	2.94	3.44	3.49	3.60	3.43	3.31	3.47	3.30
Total Achievement	41.26	54.50	51.92	53.14	63.34	**	93.67	57.58	59.34	50.00
Student Discipline *	5.00	3.00	8.00	5.00	4.00	8.00	5.00	3.00	5.13	3.52
Student Passing	100.00	93.00	99.90	95.00	98.00	88.00	93.00	100.00	95.86	91.40
Student Satisfaction	3.56	3.99	2.95	3.26	3.40	3.56	3.34	3.34	3.42	3.27
Student Self-Efficacy *	1.87	1.97	1.93	1.70	1.89	1.96	1.91	2.02	1.91	2.16
Students Complete Year	1.00	0.58	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.88	1.00	0.52	0.87	0.98

* Lower score is more positive
**Data not available

Student discipline was somewhat worse in five of the schools than in the normative sample. Site-visit schools had more discipline referrals than did the normative group. The reason may lie in the composition of the normative sample, of which 21 percent were middle level schools, 10 percent combination middle and high schools, and 69 percent high schools. Most principals who have administered both middle and high schools affirm that referrals of younger adolescents are more frequent but are often for relatively minor issues. Referrals of older adolescents are less frequent but can be relatively more serious.

Teachers and principals of the site-visit schools present a composite picture of high congruence on quality education, competent leadership, and positive attitudes about school and schooling. Their students were generally positive about school and emphatic about the degree to which they felt they could succeed.

Summary

This detailed review of the leadership and programs of the eight site-visit schools can be summarized as follows:

1. The principals of these schools were relatively young and well educated.
2. The schools were representative of grade patterns, enrollments, community types, and regions of the country.
3. Teacher groups were engaged in making decisions about school issues much more *with principals* than on their own.
4. Parents were highly involved in these schools, both in planning/advising and in programs.
5. The level of implementation and the intent to further implement teaming, exploration, and cocurricular practices were stronger than in typical schools. The schools were more typical, however, in implementing adviser-advisee and intramural programs.
6. The educational beliefs of these principals about middle level educational issues were similar to those of other principals across the country.
7. The degree of difficulty associated with making changes in these schools was comparable to most other schools.
8. The faculty and students of these schools were more satisfied with their schools than is typical.
9. The students in these schools believed they could be successful and indeed were more successful academically than is typical in other schools.
10. The principal and teachers of these schools were highly congruent in their beliefs about the importance of selected goals of education.

Chapter 2

School Profiles

This chapter includes short profiles of each site-visit school. The schools are presented in order of size, from smallest to largest. Each has been given a fictitious name, appropriate to the general region of the country where the school is located.

The profiles serve as a transition from the data-based information of the first chapter to the more descriptive information about restructuring presented in Chapters 3, 4, 5, and 6. The profiles provide a context for the extended discussion in those chapters.

❑ Mountain View Middle School

Mountain View Middle School is located among the sagebrush and flatlands of the great west. An occasional small river crosses the landscape and there is a beautiful view of the Rockies 20 miles to the west. The school of 175 students serves three very small communities with a total population of fewer than 2,000. The school is spacious and well-equipped. A community Fine Arts Center located on the campus provides an auditorium, music rooms, and classroom space.

The school began implementing "middle school programs" under the leadership of a strong principal in the early 1980s. After the principal left, the school "slipped back to a departmentalized junior high school." When the current principal arrived two years ago, middle school issues were revisited. The school was authorized to replace 5 of the 11 staff members last year and to hire persons who supported the school's vision.

In this small rural setting, the principal seems to be the creator of the vision, but the staff members actively share decisions during faculty meetings and everyone, including students, articulates the school's vision. Next year the staff members look forward to implementing teaming. Other changes are on the horizon.

❑ Metropolitan Middle Years Academy

Metropolitan Middle Years Academy is a very old, but clean, educational facility in a major metropolitan city in an eastern state. The school is located in a primarily black minority community but serves students from across the metropolitan area. The middle school began as a small and informal magnet school for gifted and primarily privileged students, but now has a fairly typical enrollment of about 250 students of diverse backgrounds and academic abilities.

The school is active in the state's Re:Learning program, and has been associated with the Coalition of Essential Schools since 1988. With less than optimum support from the district, the school continues to pursue the principles of the Coalition. Teachers want to serve in this school but burnout is viewed as a potential problem. Most teachers are secondary-certificated and somewhat uncomfortable with transition from a strictly disciplinary to an integrated approach to curriculum and instruction. The principal has been at the school for 10 years and was instrumental in involving the school in the Coalition. A major objective has been to affirm and support the need for mutual respect between students and teachers. The school culture and climate clearly reflect this effort.

❑ Maple Grove Middle School

Maple Grove Middle School celebrated its 25th anniversary as a 6–7–8 middle level school in 1993. Founded in 1968, this school of 450 serves a relatively homogeneous, upper middle class student body of a small city in the northeast region of the country. The faculty is experienced and stable. Most teachers are in their 40s or 50s. Only two new teachers were hired in the current year. The principal has more than 10 years of experience as a principal, but only two in this school. The community is highly supportive of its schools.

Programs commonly accepted as appropriate for early adolescents were initiated in the past, lapsed for a time, and are now being renewed. Teaming is present in all grades, as well as adviser-advisee and intramural programs. Faculty members are working to move from a traditional academic, content-based model of schooling to a more child-centered approach. The school is clearly in transition, with staff development activities focused on a middle school vision that is yet to be achieved.

❑ Pacific Middle School

The Pacific Middle School facility is neat and clean, with evidence of student accomplishments throughout the building. The original facility was constructed in the 1960s and has had two additions. The school currently serves approximately 500 seventh and eighth graders in this city of more than 150,000. It will nearly double in size by 1994–95, when sixth graders will be enrolled.

Cooperative efforts between the school and the community are impressive. Close collaboration provides services to the students that neither the city nor the school system could otherwise provide. The parents and civic and business community are actively involved in the life of this school. A feeling of real partnership exists between the school and the community it serves.

Staff members and administrators describe their school as child-centered, with a focus on authentic instruction, integrated curriculum, and student outcomes. Staff, students, and parents

are clearly engaged and empowered. Each group is invited to participate in the decision-making processes that shape student programs.

The classrooms are exciting places. Expectations for student performance are high. Students are given responsibility and choices about what to study and they respond appropriately. They participate in their own evaluations, respond critically about what they are doing, and develop plans for improvement. The adults in this school trust students to be responsible and to do good work; the students respond by being responsible and doing their best.

❑ Desert View Middle School

Desert View Middle School was built approximately 10 years ago in response to enrollment increases in the school district. With an enrollment of about 800 seventh and eighth graders, the school serves mostly middle class families. Approximately 10 percent of the students are minority. This suburban community is part of a major metropolitan area in the southwest.

The faculty of 45 teachers are adept at communicating the school's vision. They see themselves as receptive to new ideas and trusting of the principal's views on change. The principal's belief in collaboration is most evident in the empowerment of a leadership team. Teachers who are not part of that team report little involvement in decision making, but they appear comfortable because they have confidence in the principal. They view her as a "seed planter" who nurtures ideas with resources, staff development, and planning time—and provides support until the idea takes root in the school program.

❑ Heartland Junior High School

Heartland is a rapidly growing mid-western community of 80,000 people, most employed by the state's major university, two small colleges, five hospitals, and numerous white-collar businesses. However, Heartland serves a relatively large proportion of the city's blue-collar community. The school has grown rapidly in recent years, moving from 500 to more than 850 students, and still growing. The facility has had two major additions in recent years, but eight classrooms are still in adjacent trailers. With rapid growth, the make-up of the student body is becoming socially diverse.

The school has strong community support, as evidenced by hundreds of hours of parent-volunteer time. The staff members are experienced, academically strong, and open in their opinions. They trust their leaders, both the formal administrators and the informal group of teachers, counselors, and administrators who constitute the leadership team of the school. The principal is a relatively young and energetic instructional leader who has earned the respect of the staff. She has worked with the teachers to move the school from a rather traditional, content-centered mini high school to a more student-centered and continually restructuring institution. Faculty members realize that many changes are still ahead, including an impending district realignment of schools from 7–8–9 to 6–7 and 8–9 structures. Heartland's teachers recognize that these changes will result in the dismantling of the faculty as they know it today.

❑ Southland Middle School

Southland Middle School, the oldest building in this large southern community, was built in 1926. The facility, originally designed as a large high school serving 1,900 students, provides a

spacious, impeccably clean environment for the 1,100 students it now serves. The community has grown and changed over the years, with the percentage of minority growing from 22 percent in 1977 to approximately 60 percent today. The school also serves a military complex and, as a result, experiences a 45 percent mobility rate.

Over the years, school programs have intermittently included teaming and advisement, depending on schedule and population shifts. Southland recently moved back to teaming, but has little interdisciplinary instruction. Advisory is currently under consideration.

The school staff members have had difficulty articulating a consistent vision and mission. But there is a high degree of consensus about the purpose of the school as an "academic community and a nurturing place for students." All staff members repeatedly affirmed that at Southland "we do what is best for kids." The staff trusts the principal; they are confident he will "do the right thing for kids."

❑ Lone Star Middle School

Lone Star Middle School is one of eight middle schools in this suburban community. The district adopted a 6–7–8 organizational plan in 1975, five years before Lone Star opened. The school serves nearly 1,300 students from middle and upper-middle class families. Most classrooms are arranged in clusters, facilitating the teaming strategies used in the sixth and seventh grades for math, science, language arts, reading, and social studies. All students have a 30-minute adviser-advisee period each day, with a self-esteem curriculum at least one day each week.

The professional staff of 76 members were consistent in articulating a child-centered mission for the school. Restructuring in this school was very informal, often resulting from discussion and ideas originating with the principal. The staff members credited the principal with recognizing the need for change, finding ways and means to educate staff members about the changes, and working with them to develop strategies for change. Faculty members have confidence in the principal because of his proven track record. Collectively, the staff members were very student-oriented, acknowledging that they still have much to accomplish to meet student needs.

Summary

Site-visit schools were located in all geographic regions of the country and metropolitan, urban, and rural environments. They ranged in size from a small school of 175 students in the mountain region to a large and complex institution of 1,300 in the southwest.

The site-visit schools were "works-in-progress," with varying levels of implementation of the typical middle school model. All schools were student-centered and attempted to include staff members, students, and parents in decision making. Principals showed strong leadership in all these institutions. Faculty members held high expectations for students and were committed to collaboration for school improvement. The schools had strong community support.

Instructional arrangements varied from the traditional to sophisticated teaming approaches.

Chapter 3

Visions of Middle Level Education

What are the visions of successfully restructuring middle level schools? How have these visions changed in the last five years? What visions will guide the schools five years from now? What processes were used to formulate these visions? To what extent are they supported by parents and community members, by administrators and teachers, and by students?

To answer these questions, structured interviews (Appendix E) were conducted with members of leadership teams, groups of teachers, and groups of students from the eight site-visit schools. The data from these structured interviews were supplemented by systematic classroom observations, shadow studies of seventh graders, informal classroom visitations, and written information from the schools' *Design Statements* (Appendix D).

The information gathered on personal and school visions is the focus of this chapter. The first section will report personal visions of the members of the leadership teams and teacher groups and the processes used to arrive at those visions. Second, the visions of the schools five years ago, today, and five years from now will be discussed. Third, the processes used to arrive at those visions will be identified. The chapter will conclude with an examination of the support that exists for these visions from parents and community, teachers and administrators, and students.

Personal Visions of Middle Level Education

The personal visions of middle level education held by teachers, administrators, students, parents, and community members and the factors that contributed to development of those visions are reported in this first section.

❑ Personal Visions of Middle Level Education

Members of both the leadership teams and teacher groups defined their personal visions for middle level education from a variety of viewpoints. These viewpoints could be classified in the following categories (Figure 3.1):

1. Safe, nurturing environments for students, teachers, and administrators
2. School organization—programs, curriculum, and instruction
3. Developmental appropriateness of schooling
4. Relevance of experiences for young adolescents
5. Student skills
6. Learning for the future
7. Fostering creativity
8. Using technology.

Teachers, administrators, staff members, parents, and students who participated in these structured interviews gave great significance in their visions to creating climates of success; establishing comfortable, safe, nurturing environments; promoting healthy values; placing emphasis on socio-emotional growth; and building collegiality and involvement. School organization was also an important dimension in these personal visions. Those interviewed frequently used specific programs, curricular organization, or instructional practices to define their visions. Most often identified were exploration; teachers as coaches and facilitators; variety of learning/teaching styles; multiple, hands-on types of learning experiences; individual student choices; cooperative learning; and interdisciplinary teaming.

Developmental appropriateness and relevance of schooling to young adolescents were frequently identified. Meeting the needs of all students, educating the whole child, and creating a sense of belonging/ownership were key issues in the category of developmental appropriateness. Under school relevancy, areas identified as important to young adolescent learners were concepts such as: "apply knowledge to real world situations," "bring the world to them," "make school usable," and "deal with personal issues in their lives—now."

Although the other areas were not identified as frequently, interviewees did mention the importance of skill development, learning for the future, fostering creativity, and using technology.

❑ Factors That Influenced the Development of Personal Visions

The development of these personal visions was influenced by several factors. Research and study were most frequently cited by leadership team members and by teacher groups, including the examination of research on middle level practices, the study of middle level education (reading *Turning Points*, etc.), participating in staff development, attending conferences, and visiting successful schools. Participants also described the importance of school culture in building a vision. Statements such as "great staff that wants to improve," "encouragement to grow and learn," "freedom to try new programs," "eagerness to improve," "staff members are life-long learners," "we're always analyzing what we are doing," and "working together with other teachers," characterized the cultural factors undergirding personal visions.

FIGURE 3.1

Personal Visions of Middle Level Education

1. Safe, Nurturing Environments (Faculty and Students)

Multiple opportunities for success without failure

Building self-esteem

Emotional support

Focus on becoming

Nurturing high respect

Comfortable environment

Developing positive peer relationships

Teacher as nurturer

Positive models to reinforce healthy values

School as a family

More emphasis on socio-emotional growth, less on academics

Provide atmosphere of understanding

Warm, safe environment

Respect for learning in all students

Teachers care and listen

Stability of staff

Faculty that likes each other/works together

Risk taking supported

Teachers make decisions and are listened to

2. School Organization (Programs, Curriculum, Instruction)

Exploration

Teachers as coaches/facilitators

Variety of teaching and learning

Hands-on approaches to learning

Teaming-interdisciplinary/small group learning environments

Lots of open-ended activities

Individualizing choices

Cooperative learning

Student directed learning

Multi-sensory learning

3. Developmental Appropriateness

Needs of students driving the curriculum

Meeting needs of and educating the "whole" child

Creating sense of belonging/ownership

Addressing academic, social, and personal needs of students

Meeting needs of all students

Providing programs beyond academic needs

Meeting needs of the individual

Places where kids can physically interact with the learning process

Students are active learners

4. Relevance to Young Adolescents

Need for students to see relevance in learning/why it is important to them

Applying knowledge to real-world situations

Special activities that show students why information is important

Bringing the world to them

Dealing with personal issues in their lives—now

Tying in the "why" of learning and linking it with the community

Making school usable

School is fun/exciting

5. Student Skills

Learning how to learn

Conflict resolution

Academic skills

Math problem solving

Decision-making skills

Communication skills

6. Learning for the Future

Life-long learning

Preparing for the job market

Developing good citizenship

7. Creativity

Opportunity to be creative

Thinking artistically

Publishing student work

8. Technology

Technology in every classroom

The needs of students and community members (need for student involvement, changing needs of students and community, and changing social conditions) and professional experience (observing students and years of experience at being successful) also influenced personal visions. Experience in rearing and teaching their own children during their early adolescent years was mentioned by several teachers as important influences. In addition, several groups mentioned the importance of the school principal and of strategic planning processes in shaping their visions of middle level schooling.

School Mission and Visions

School visions of the past, present, and future are the focus of this section. The descriptions include the current visions of the eight schools, visions of five years ago, and anticipated visions for five years hence. The section begins with a summary of the schools' mission statements (purpose). Some of these statements are not sharply defined and tend to overlap with the school visions (action agenda). Nevertheless, they are conceptually helpful to understanding the general orientation of the schools.

❑ Current Missions of the Schools–School Design Statements

Current mission statements (Figure 3.2) taken from the *School Design Statements* (Appendix D) of seven study schools reflect five major topics:

1. **Collaboration**
   - Creating a learning-centered community
   - Reflecting the desires of students, staff members, parents, and community members
   - Building a better school together
   - Empowering students and staff members with decision-making tools
2. **Needs of Early Adolescent Learners**
   - Curriculum and instruction organized and matched to the unique developmental characteristics of middle level students
   - Quality education for appropriate development during the adolescent years
   - Commitment to meeting the needs of our learners
   - Addressing individual student needs
3. **Supportive School Culture**
   - A caring environment
   - A sense of belonging/ownership
   - Encouragement and support for each individual
   - Social interaction and growth opportunities in a safe environment
4. **Learning for the Future**
   - Students learning to responsibly meet the challenges of the future
   - Students prepared to live as productive members of the 21st century

- Active, life-long learners
- Preparation for success in a diverse and changing world

5. Academic Learning/Skills

- Acquiring critical thinking skills
- Integrating academic, explorative, and thematic learning
- Challenging students academically
- Maintaining high standards of academic achievement.

In addition to these five dimensions, other concepts frequently cited in mission statements included excellence, citizenship, self-worth/self-esteem, quality, involvement, personal commitment, and pride.

❑ Current Visions of the Schools–Structured Interviews

Leadership team members and teacher groups were asked to "Describe the current vision for the school." In general, the responses to this question reflected available written vision statements. The leadership team at Heartland described its vision as one of continuing "to evolve so that every child can be successful—we do not know what that will be. Our vision has not changed over time—our methods to get there will change." Another school leadership team characterized its current vision as a quest to provide an "environment for students to develop physically, socially, intellectually, and emotionally." There was a high level of consistency among the school leadership teams about their current school visions. In seven of the eight schools, major emphasis was placed on responding to the developmental needs of students. Terms such as "child-centeredness," "child-centered with focus on relevancy," "student-centered community," "learning-centered community," "enjoyable environment for learning," and "caring environments" were used frequently to define school visions.

At Desert View the leadership team talked about the congruence of their personal visions and the school's vision. The consensus of the group was, "We are living our personal visions, acting out our desires and beliefs. Our personal norm is the school norm. We are doing what we ask the kids to do."

Members of teacher groups from six schools characterized their school visions under two major categories: major concepts and specific programs. Some of the major concepts included: "treat every child as they need to be treated—discipline, academics," "recognize importance of social growth," "academics are important—so is citizenship," "increase likelihood that kids will make good choices," "schools need to be a happy place for kids," "kids should have ample opportunities to succeed," and "we teach kids, not subjects. If you do this, the other comes." Programs and strategies identified by teacher groups included: integration and connecting curriculum, real-world experience, problem solving, block scheduling, interdisciplinary teaming, outcomes, restructuring, schools-within-a-school, and values instruction.

In two schools the consensus of the teacher groups was that their current school vision was unclear. One of the schools categorized the current vision as "blurred at present," while the other school had difficulty articulating its vision.

FIGURE 3.2

Current Mission Statements—School Design Statements

Desert View

The Desert View staff believes in the self-worth of each individual at Desert View Middle School. Our curriculum and instruction are organized and matched to the unique developmental characteristics of middle level students and to create a sense of belonging for all. Our purpose is to cultivate good citizenship, self-discipline, and responsibility.

Our emphasis is to prepare our middle level students for living as productive members of the 21st century through the integration of academic, explorative, and thematic learning.

Heartland

We believe that every child can learn and in order to enable each child to maximize his/her potential, we are committed to meeting the needs of our learners."Building a Better School Together," our school motto, demands the commitment and excellence of every staff member.

Lone Star

The mission of Lone Star Middle School is to create a unique caring environment in which students acquire critical thinking skills, achieve personal excellence, and become citizens who responsibly meet the challenges of the future.

Maple Grove

The Maple Grove Middle School is a collaborative, student-centered community in which each individual is encouraged, supported, and academically challenged to become an active life-long learner.

Metro

The mission of Metro Middle School is to create a learning-centered community actively engaged in the adventure of quality learning and preparation for success in a changing, diverse world.

Mountain View

We, the parents, staff, and students of Mountain View Middle School are committed to providing a consistent and enjoyable environment in which students can achieve self-esteem and a quality education while developing through the adolescent years.

Pacific

Pacific reflects the desires of students, staff, parents, and community. We at Pacific INSIST on high standards of academic achievement, PROMOTE social, interaction, and growth opportunities in a safe environment, ADDRESS individual needs and strengths, FOSTER parent/community involvement, GENERATE a strong sense of pride, and INSTILL democratic principles by empowering students and staff with decision-making tools.

Qualitative differences were evident in the ways leadership teams and teacher groups described their school's current vision. Leadership team members tended to define in larger concepts, while teacher group members were more concrete. Members of leadership teams commonly have broad roles and responsibilities, more involvement with restructuring issues, and more opportunity to participate in decision-making processes. Teacher roles are usually more focused, with typically less opportunity to consider restructuring issues and to be involved in decision making. Teachers tend to view vision and restructuring in terms of specific organizational, curricular, and instructional issues.

To determine the impact of the current school vision on the young adolescents enrolled in these schools, randomly selected students from the eight schools were asked two questions about school mission: "What is the purpose of this school?" and "What are the two most important things this school stands for?" When asked about the purpose of the school, student groups from six schools said it was to "get a good education." Five of the student groups responded that "preparation for high school" was the major purpose of their school. Other responses included "so as you move on, you will know history, etc.," "prepare for life and a job," "help kids grow up," "academics and sports," and "learning social skills, getting involved, chances to know people."

The students at Heartland were quite comprehensive in describing the purposes of their school:

> To prepare you for life, for a career, and for the things you need every day; teach you that your opinion really means something and that you should value your own opinion.

Students from one school expressed a cynical opinion about their school's purpose. They identified "to educate us" and to "prepare us for high school" as purposes, but also "not talk to friends in the hall."

When asked to name the "two most important things this school stands for," three students groups identified "academics." Other responses varied but provide interesting insights about student perceptions. The following are representative of student comments:

- Help you understand responsibility; each year you get more privileges
- Caring leadership
- Good education and respect
- Education is the right to talk, free speech
- Leadership and sports
- Cultural diversity, activities, involvement in community, and togetherness.

The answers to this question reflect some of the elements of school mission as articulated by leadership teams and teacher groups. This is particularly true with regard to student responsibility, rights and privileges, support and nurturance, and leadership.

❑ Visions That Informed the Schools Five Years Ago

When asked to "describe the vision that informed this school five years ago," the leadership teams of three schools reported that their vision then was the same as their current vision. Two leadership teams reported that their schools had "no real vision" five years ago, two leadership teams identified different visions, and one school did not respond to the question.

Three leadership teams reported that their school vision had remained the same. Lone Star said their current vision, developed five years ago, was exactly the same. Leadership teams from Desert View and Heartland saw their visions as the same, but the process of implementation had changed. Desert View spoke about "different stages of implementation. We were transforming from a junior high school to a middle school, trying to meet needs but not being successful, trying to adapt."

Of the two leadership teams reporting no real vision five years ago, the team from Mountain View felt that former school operation had been strictly reactive. Before "we just spent time, now we anticipate." At Pacific Middle School, the leadership team said their school was more content-oriented in the past and had fewer activities. "We had started to innovate—take risks—but we really didn't have a vision."

FIGURE 3.3

Visions That Informed the Schools Five Years Ago—Leadership Teams

Desert View

The vision was the same

Transforming from junior high to middle school

Trying to meet needs of kids but not being successful

Trying to adapt

We were at different stages of implementation

Heartland

Same vision as five years ago

Meet the needs of all students

Reality as to how to meet these needs has evolved

The support system has improved

Lone Star

The vision is the same

Current vision was developed five years ago

Maple Grove

Vision was student centered but more based on the traditional high school preparation norms (Junior High Model)

Metro

No response

Mountain View

Reactionary—no real vision

Before we just spent time—now we anticipate

Pacific

Didn't really have a vision, didn't talk about it

Started to innovate—take risks—but didn't have a real vision

More content oriented

Fewer activities

Generally more dull

Southland

Emphasis on traditional aspects of school

Poor community perceptions of school

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The visions of two schools had changed during the past five years. The Maple Grove leadership team described its former vision as being "student-centered but more based on a traditional high school preparation—junior high model." At Southland the former vision had placed "emphasis on the traditional aspects of school."

The reactions of teacher groups to the question about past visions diverged somewhat from those of leadership team members (Figure 3.4). When teachers from Lone Star, Desert View, and Heartland were asked about their schools' former vision (the leadership teams had reported no change), only Heartland teachers agreed that there had been no change. The teachers from Lone Star described their past vision as one emphasizing state comprehensive tests, a more intellectual focus, and time-on-task, while teachers from Desert View saw their former vision as one of transition, making the core subject system work well, eliminating tracking, and implementing cooperative learning.

Leadership teams and teacher groups from Maple Grove and Pacific tended to agree about their schools' vision of five years ago. The leadership team at Southland, however, saw the former vision as emphasizing the traditional aspects of schooling, while the teacher group saw it as a vision of success for all students with an emphasis on teaming.

FIGURE 3.4

Visions That Informed the Schools Five Years Ago—Teacher Groups

Desert View

Make core subject system work
Cooperative learning
Eliminate tracking

Heartland

Vision same as now
Good caring climate

Lone Star

Emphasis on state-comprehensive tests
More intellectual focus
Emphasis on time-on-task

Maple Grove

School was driven by commitment to academic excellence (still very important but now have more focus on whole child)
Curriculum was taught as separate subjects

Metro

No response
Note: All teachers were on leadership team

Mountain View

No response

Pacific

Desire to create positive climate
Thought positive climate would produce better results
Work on self-concept
Wanted to draw in more parent and community resources

Southland

That all students would be successful
Teaming was more of a focus

❑ The Visions That Will Inform the Schools Five Years from Now

When asked to think about their school and what it would be like in five years, leadership teams from five schools said they would change their vision, but those from the remaining three schools said they would stay the same. Schools that saw their visions changing emphasized how they would do it. For instance, leadership team members at Lone Star said that "kids are growing fast today and schools must be more a part of meeting the socio-emotional needs of students and helping parents develop a better relationship with their children." Other schools answered in a similar fashion. Even the leadership teams that saw no need for change in their current visions talked about the ways changes could be made.

Teacher groups from all schools in the sample said they would change the current vision; their responses once again suggested organizational, curricular, and instructional changes.

As a follow-up to this question, leadership teams and teacher groups were asked how they would actually change their school visions (Figure 3.5). Interpreting their responses to this question requires that the following factors be weighed.

1. The three leadership teams that said they would *not* change answered this question and suggested ways in which they *would* change.
2. In a related question, these same leadership teams, plus one more, said that they would not change the school *mission* as written in the *School Design Statement.* Two other schools indicated they would change the mission statement, but one qualified its response by stating "only gradually." Two schools did not respond.
3. With the exception of the Heartland leadership team and the Desert View teachers group, all groups responded to this question in terms of school organization and new programs, the curriculum and its organization, the implementation of instructional strategies, and new roles that they as teachers and administrators would assume.

These somewhat conflicting responses seem to suggest that some leadership team members and teacher groups were confusing "vision" with "mission." Both the leadership team at Heartland and the teacher group at Desert View, however, emphasized the enduring importance of their school's mission and of continuing program modification to accomplish it.

Factors That Influenced the Determination of Middle Level School Visions

Members of the leadership teams and the teacher groups in the eight site-visit schools were asked during the structured interviews to reflect on the development of their visions of five years ago, their current visions, and their anticipated visions for five years hence. This section reports the processes used in the development of school visions.

❑ Factors Influencing Vision Development–Five Years Ago

Leadership team members and teacher groups suggested factors in six major categories that influenced their vision development five years ago. These included processes, school culture, role of

the principal, needs of students, staff, and community, staff development, and values and belief systems. (See Figure 3.6.) These factors provide a useful planning outline for other schools that may wish to develop a comprehensive vision statement.

FIGURE 3.5

Anticipated Visions of Five Years into the Future—Leadership Teams and Teacher Groups

Desert View

Vision always to help students—the way you achieve it changes

Change will depend upon what students need

We will learn what works and build on it

More multi-media and technology

More articulation with elementary and high schools

Full articulation of instruction and assessment

Professional development supported by the district

Site-centered decision making more natural

Heartland

Our vision will remain on the child not the program

We will continue to look at educating ourselves and the way we work with students

Students will need to live in a different world—technology, etc.

Spend more time on teaching life and relationship skills

Act more as a coach, role model, friend

Lone Star

School intervention with parents

School must play more of a role in values

School will be more of a "mother" and "father"

Students will get more involved with parenting

Schools must be better equipped to deal with students who have learning difficulties

Maple Grove

A truly integrated curriculum with service to the community, based on strong authentic learning and assessment

Metro

No response

Mountain View

Technology

Strengthening middle school advisory council

Get kids back from home schooling

Pacific

Modify vision to accommodate double the enrollment

More class discussion/interaction

Use of community experts

More students teaching each other

Southland

More school-based social services

Increased outreach efforts—parent education

More interagency coordination of efforts

More partnerships with the business community

Smaller classes

Eager learners

Parent choices

Rigorous curriculum

Learning for application—hands-on, real life learning experiences

FIGURE 3.6

Factors Influencing Vision Development Five Years Ago

Processes	Needs (Student, Staff, Community)
Strategic planning	Need to take on more parental responsibilities
Data gathering from regional accreditation process	More emphasis on social development
Accreditation tasks brought focus	Community concern about racial imbalance
Staff meeting identified directions	Need to improve school climate
A variety of decision-making techniques	Knowledge of future growth made it necessary to focus on needs
School Culture	Make-up of student body was changing
Risk taking was encouraged	Need for good achievement scores and high school preparation
Closeness of faculty	**Staff Development**
Principal emphasis on creating positive climate	Purposes of middle level schools
Openness to try new things, then refine	Study and reflection
Role of Principal	Attending conferences
A visionary leader	Sharing information
Gave options of things to look for—we gave them meaning	**Values and Belief Systems**
New principal—new ideas	Developing total faculty commitment
Directives from principal	Wanting to do the best for kids
Strong leadership	Wanting to expand interdisciplinary teaming
Principal was more progressive	Maintaining traditional notions of schooling

❑ Factors Influencing Vision Development–Current School Visions

The responses from leadership teams and teacher groups about the factors that influenced the current school vision also may be grouped into six similar categories: specific processes for planning and involvement; positive school culture; principal leadership; needs of students, parents, and the community; staff development; and values and beliefs (Figure 3.7).

In seven of the eight schools, leadership teams and teacher groups described specific processes that influenced their visions. They frequently mentioned specific strategies for restructuring such as those from the Coalition of Essential Schools and Onward to Excellence, as well as those used in preparation for National School Recognition programs; procedures for staff, student, and parent input/involvement in determining priorities and solving problems; planning groups, advisory

FIGURE 3.7

Factors Influencing Vision Development—Current School Visions

Processes

Assess the success of what you are doing

Staff and parent planning; achieving consensus

Community involvement

Staff meeting to determine priorities for the next three years

Advisory council

Listening

Onward to Excellence—Mission, Vision, Goals, Objectives

Procedures from the Coalition of Essential Schools

Interdisciplinary planning meetings; Team leader meetings

Forum for presenting concerns

Competition in national school recognition programs

Processes for working on the shared vision

Investigating possibilities

Positive School Cultu.. e

Much give and take among faculty

Staff feels free to provide input

Vision is focused on the kids

Comfortable that we have not arrived or will not arrive

Acceptance of self-assessment and ongoing changes

Good communication

Principal promotes positive climate-praise

Positive culture of students and family

Good faculty consensus—they all "buy in"

Teachers working hard in the core

Previous success encourages us to continue to change

Principal

Principal open to ideas; welcomes new ideas; open to staff trying new ideas

Principal has a new idea every week

Principal gives overall perspective but teachers have freedom in their classrooms

Principal lets staff "run it"—school is run from the ground up

New principal and superintendent helped to determine vision

Strong leadership by principal

Guidance from principal

Vision developed over time with guidance from the principal

Staff Development

Attend conferences and report back to staff

Visit successful schools

Opportunities for staff development; opportunities to learn

Speakers and consultants

Reading research

Values/Beliefs

Willingness to give up old beliefs

Pursuit of excellence—we're going to be the best

Determining what's really important

We're here for the kids

Needs

Awareness of current student needs

Awareness of student needs in the '90s

Responding to highly motivated parents

councils, staff meetings, team meetings, team leader meetings, and forums for discussing concerns; and ongoing assessment and reflection.

A positive school culture, the leadership of the principal, and staff development opportunities were identified as important factors influencing vision development in four of the eight schools. In the four schools that cited principal leadership, the following items were frequently mentioned:

- Principal is open to, welcomes, and suggests new ideas
- Gives overall perspective, but teachers have freedom in the classroom
- Principal lets staff "run with it—school is run from the ground up"
- "The principal helped determine the vision"
- "Strong leadership from the principal."

Analysis of the structured interview data showed that the Lone Star leadership team and teacher group placed greater importance on the principal's role in this process than did other schools.

Also identified as shaping the current vision, but not cited as frequently, were values/belief systems and responses to specific student, parental, and community needs.

❑ Factors Influencing Vision Development–Anticipated Visions for the Future

Four major areas guided the development of anticipated school visions: trends, new knowledge, attitudes, and processes. Respondents identified important trends in society, changing demands in the business world, and availability of technology. New knowledge encompassed "knowledge of the state-of-the-art in education," "new practice," " vocational education," and "learning style." Attitude factors included being responsive to changing needs, openness and willingness to try, and the acknowledgment that "we need to be prepared for change."

Finally, several processes were cited: assessment of attitudes, achievement test scores, interaction with each other, student input, and monitoring and adjusting.

Evidence in Support of Current School Visions

To determine the support for the current vision, members of the leadership teams and teacher groups were asked the following three questions:

1. What evidence do you have that parents and community members support the current vision?
2. What evidence do you have that the administrators and teachers of the school support the current vision?
3. What evidence do you have that the students of the school support this vision?

Students were also asked if they liked their schools—why or why not—and what was best about their schools. Research team members examined the *School Design Statement* and the CASE-IMS survey profiles for further information. The reporting of these data constitutes the substance of the final section of this chapter.

❑ Parent and Community Support of Current School Vision

When asked for evidence of parent and community support for the current school vision, leadership teams and teacher groups cited the number of parents and community members who volunteered their services, types of communications they received from the home and community, kinds of involvement in school planning committees and service organizations, attendance at meetings and parent/teacher conferences, kinds of requests for information, and assumptions about their schools' reputation in the community.

Teams and teacher groups from four schools identified extensive support for their current vision by describing their parent volunteer programs. Typical responses were: "The number of parent volunteers in our school indicate support"; "More parents want to help—they even take off work to volunteer"; "Strong volunteer program"; and "150–200 parents volunteered this year for a total of more than 1,200 hours."

Other types of parent services included support for athletics, willingness to chaperone field trips, business partnerships, and participation in cocurricular activities.

The nature of communications with the school was cited by three schools as supportive evidence—notes, acknowledgments, parental telephone calls, and comments such as "parents tell us that we know you want the best for our child." Parental involvement was reported by four schools on strategic planning committees, advisory committees, and campus improvement teams; in writing mission statements; and working on curriculum improvement teams.

Attendance at meetings, parent-teacher conferences, athletic events, and musicals was mentioned frequently as evidence of parental support. Three schools cited requests for information and services. Leadership team members and teacher groups also mentioned parents' requests for help in working with and understanding their young adolescents, requests for additional parent-teacher conferences, frequent telephone calls to teachers and administrators requesting information, and increased parental concern for student progress.

A final area teams and teacher groups identified was the school's reputation in the community. One leadership team said, "Parents like what this school represents and they appreciate what goes on here." The teacher group from the same school added, "Our community is well-informed and we get no negative responses; there's a mutual appreciation." Another leadership team cited specific evidence of support. "More transfer of unsuccessful students to this school than any other school in the district. We are proud that we can deal effectively with at-risk students."

❑ Administrator and Teacher Support of Current School Vision

Leadership teams and teacher groups were asked to cite specific evidence of administrator and teacher support of the current school vision. Three schools did not respond to this question. Responses from the remaining leadership teams and teacher groups can be grouped into five areas: collegiality and pride, participation, principal leadership, commitment, and programs (Figure 3.8).

There was a strong sense of collegiality and pride among the respondents. They were proud of their accomplishments, their uniformity of purpose, and their school cultures of mutual support. Support for their schools' current vision was justified by examples of participation (in staff development, school events, and sharing time with students), principal leadership (messages of encour-

agement, emotional support, staff development opportunities, openness, trustworthiness), commitment (outside time given, dedication to vision, support for change, hard work, unselfish desire to help students), and program successes (trying to integrate curriculum).

The CASE-IMS data for these eight schools (see Chapter 1) leave little doubt that there is strong support for the school visions. In all eight schools, the degree of agreement on the importance of 14 selected goals is much above average, validating a commonality of belief among teachers and administrators.

FIGURE 3.8

Evidence of Administrator and Teacher Support of Current Visions—Structured Interviews

Collegiality and Pride

Buttons; T-shirts; banners

Evidence of school pride

We encourage each other

Widespread consultation and consensus; high consensus

No cliques among the staff

Good cooperation

Low teacher turnover

We're looking forward to working together

We support each other

We're together on this

Participation

Staff members actively seek development opportunities; excellent attendance at staff development programs

Staff members attend school events to support students

Frequent sharing of non-class time with students

Principal Leadership

Personal messages (from principal) that symbolize support

Principal provides emotional support

Principal supports staff development

Principal is open to suggestions

Faculty trusts the leadership

Commitment

Amount of time teachers work outside school hours

Dedication to school vision

Support for innovation and change

Open-minded approval

No sabotage of programs

Hard workers; all work very hard; go the extra mile

We always seem to find a higher purpose

Unselfish desire of teachers to serve students

Program

Positive risk-taking programs for students

The success of our core program

The overall success of all our programs

Trying to integrate curriculum and looking at teaming and block scheduling

Positive student outcomes

Faculty/staff surveys

❑ Student Support of Current School Vision

Leadership teams and teacher groups from all the schools were quite sure that their students supported the school vision. The leadership team from one school epitomized this perception by stating that "they know why they are here; our objectives and mission are emphasized; the principal makes them hear him; he establishes expectations for respect." A teacher group from another school suggested that "all students know the vision." In most cases, leadership team members and teacher groups tended to describe student support for the current vision from the following points of view: school pride, student engagement, and students liking the school.

Indicators of school pride included the appearance of the campus, no graffiti, no theft of school equipment, and no major vandalism.

Student engagement was the most frequently cited indication of student support of the school vision. Engagement factors included:

- Number of students on honor roll; increasing number on honor roll
- Consistency of attendance; high attendance rate; lower incidence of absenteeism and tardies
- Time after school to work on projects; time spent after school
- Students going to library during lunch
- Involvement in activities; joining clubs and teams; participation in activities and clubs
- Willingness to work hard
- Student leaders assisting with assemblies and school announcements
- Willingness to work out problems
- Students supporting courtesy and encouraging respect
- Students talking about rather than acting on their aggressions
- Participation in business internships
- Students calling teachers at home
- Peer tutoring; helping others out
- Taking the initiative
- Fewer discipline referrals
- Exhibiting positive attitudes.

Leadership team members and teacher groups also cited the number of students who liked the school as evidence of support for the vision. Three schools, for instance, cited the frequency of students coming back from high school to visit. These returning students talked fondly about their time at the school. Their remarks typically were "these were the best days of my life," and "this school was like home." Other testimonials of student support were that "transfers from other schools tell us they like it here," "students cry on the last day of school," and "students don't want to take time off from school."

To assess the students' own perceptions of the school vision, students at all eight schools were asked, "Do you like this school? Why or why not?" and "What is best about this school?" Five student groups voted an unqualified "yes" when asked if they liked their schools; two groups said "yes, but"; and one group said "no."

When asked why they liked their schools, the five positive groups gave the following responses:

- Friendly; students and teachers make you feel welcome
- Teachers and administrators trust us; they treat us like adults
- Everybody in our school is somebody; our school is one big happy family; everybody looks out for everyone else; you don't have to worry about being safe
- They make it comfortable for you; you don't have to be good (smart) to answer questions; if you get it wrong, they explain it
- Most kids like this school; waiting list to get in; it's better than the neighborhood school.

Two student groups said they liked their school but qualified their answers:

- Like this school but wish the teachers would make it more fun
- Like the school—good place to walk around—but somebody is always watching you.

Teaming had just been introduced in the school whose students were negative. The reactions of the students were, "Most kids don't like the teaming because they don't have enough contact with different kids. Teams are good for teachers, but not for kids." These students also believed that "some teachers have a bad attitude; they don't understand kids."

When asked, "What's best about this school?" students cited various factors such as small classes, safety, love, family-like environment, teachers, administrators, clubs, and activities. Teachers and climate factors (family, love, friendliness, positive atmosphere, and safety) were mentioned by five of the student groups. Clubs and activities were mentioned by four, and friends and students by three (Figure 3.9).

On the CASE-IMS surveys, students from the eight schools had very high scores on *student self-efficacy*. Clearly, students felt a sense of success in these schools.

Summary

The mission and vision of a school are strong determinants of the direction the school will take. When shared by administrators, teachers, staff members, students, parents, and community, a vision becomes a powerful tool for building consensus, establishing direction, and facilitating cooperative decision making.

School mission statements, as reported in the *School Design Statements* of all the schools, included emphases on collaboration, needs of young adolescents, supportive school cultures, learning for the future, and academic and learning skills. Leadership team and teacher group members supported these missions.

The *personal visions* of leadership team members and teacher groups in this study included safe nurturing environments, school organization, developmental appropriateness, relevant experiences, skill development, learning for the future, creativity, and technology. Factors that helped shape these personal visions included research and study, staff development, school visitations, and supportive school environments.

Current visions of the schools emphasized the developmental needs of students and specific programs and strategies such as integration of curriculum, block scheduling, interdisciplinary teaming, restructuring, etc.

School visions of five years ago were the same in three schools, unclear in two schools, and different from the current vision in two schools. In those schools with differences, there had been a move away from the traditional junior high approach and a reduction in the emphasis on comprehensive testing.

FIGURE 3.9

Student Descriptions of "What Is Best About Their Schools"

Desert View

We can't choose what's best because if any part were missing, it wouldn't be as good...lots of love, like a family

Heartland

Small classes
Few fights
Fun activities
Teachers are active and cheer you up
Everybody treats you like family here...even the janitor...They want you to feel like being at home

Lone Star

Being with friends
Teachers
Clubs and activities

Maple Grove

It's safe
Easy to learn
People care
Students
Administration

Metro

Small school
Small classes
Teachers
Lunch—for socialization

Mountain View

Kids
Athletics
Good education—people go to college
Student council
Everyone is someone special
Teachers
Good communication with teachers

Pacific

Friendliness
Activities
Awards

Southland

Friends
Students
Some teachers
Sports
Positive atmosphere

When asked if their *anticipated visions for five years hence* would be different, five schools indicated that they would change. The changes, however, reflected organization, curriculum, and instruction rather than the vision itself. Three schools said their visions would remain the same but the processes to accomplish them would likely change.

Factors that influenced the determination of school visions five years ago included specific processes and strategies; positive school cultures; principal leadership; needs of students, staff, and community; staff development; and values and belief systems. Factors in the development of the schools' current visions, although similar to those for five years ago, placed greater emphasis on processes, supportive school cultures, principal leadership, and staff development. Values and beliefs also figured strongly in these current visions. Looking forward five years into the future, leadership teams and teacher groups identified new trends and issues, knowledge of the state-of-the-art in education, attitudes, and processes as key influences.

Evidence of *parent and community support for the current vision* was identified with numbers of parents and community volunteers, communications from parents, involvement in school planning and curriculum activities, attendance at school functions, frequency of requests for information, and views about the schools' reputation. *Administrator and teacher support of the current vision* was verified by several factors: collegiality and pride, participation, principal leadership, and programs. CASE-IMS data clearly supported a commonality of beliefs among teachers and administrators.

The visions of the eight restructuring schools focused on the needs of the young adolescents they served. These visions were developed in collegial environments, with parent and community involvement.

The evidence offered in favor of *student support of school visions* was focused on school pride, student engagement, and students "liking the school." Students appeared to agree with their leadership teams and teacher groups; seven of the eight student groups said they liked their schools. They also identified small classes, safety, love, family-like environments, teachers, administrators, clubs, and activities as "what's best" about their schools. CASE-IMS scores on student self-efficacy were above national norms in each of the eight schools.

The visions of the eight restructuring schools focused on the needs of the young adolescents they served. These visions were developed in collegial environments, with parent and community involvement. Although comprehensive evidence was lacking, the leadership teams and teacher groups felt strongly that the school visions were supported by parents and communities, administrators and teachers, and the students. Clearly, these eight schools are in the process of becoming "learning communities" committed to enhancing the education of their students.

Chapter 4

Philosophical, Psychological, and Organizational Assumptions

Building a "community of learners" is an essential element of improving schools (Barth, 1990). Barth maintains that schools are places "where students discover, and adults rediscover, the joys, the difficulties, and the satisfactions of learning....In a community of learners, learning is endemic and mutually visible" (p.43). The assumptions of the community of learners include a belief in their capacity to improve themselves, and the need to improve the quality of interpersonal relationships and the nature and quality of learning experiences.

The eight successfully restructuring middle level schools in this study exemplified communities of learning. "Community" was a persistent theme during site visits. Specific philosophical, psychological, and organizational assumptions held by administrators, teachers, students, and parents that create the conditions for the "community of learners" were visible. This chapter is organized around eight themes that emerged as members of the research team interviewed, observed, and interacted with the members of the school communities.

1. *Collaboration and consensus is critical, yet a high level of trust in the administration, particularly the principal, is needed. The principal seems to be the creator of the vision but it is owned and implemented by all.*

The 1983 NASSP study of the middle level principalship (Keefe et al.), found that "all principals in the study believed that teachers were at least somewhat influential in the decision-making process" (p.23). Meaningful collaboration with all concerned parties is now an essential condition in American education.

Parents, teachers, administrators, support persons, and students shared a high degree of consensus for the missions and visions of these restructuring schools. The vehicles for collaboration and consensus were the leadership team and productive, open dialogue with faculty members, students, and parents. A function of leadership teams was to help the principal establish school goals and objectives and to generate

a vision for the school. Teams delineated, streamlined, and clarified the decison-making process. One teacher said the "vision from the principal is essential. But, decisions are made by the group. Although not everyone may agree with the decision, everyone was involved and had the opportunity to be heard."

In smaller schools, decisions were made during faculty meetings. The principal proposed the agenda, but the decisions were made with total faculty involvement. In larger schools, the vision of the school was formed through ongoing dialogue between administrators, leadership team members, the rest of the faculty, students, and parents. Teams were an integral part of the decision-making procedures of the school and an important link with the faculty as a whole.

Students were a part of the decision-making process in these restructuring schools. One student said that they "talked about what to do in the school in advisement classes. We decided on our noon break activities. We just need to talk to our student council representatives and they take the decisions to the principal. The student council is important in this school." Another said, "I'm on student senate. We do things to help out at school. Changes occurred because of student suggestions."

In each school, the principal had a clear vision for the school, but as one teacher said, "the principal can have a vision, but he has to have someone in the classroom to carry out that vision." Teachers, students, and parents in these restructuring schools developed ownership in the school through a genuine process of collaboration and consensus building.

2. *Community involvement in the school is imperative.*

A sense of community pervaded these schools, both in the school building and outside the school with families, business partnerships, and the community at large. These schools were committed to involving parents in their children's education through home and school associations and advisory councils. Community agencies and local services were viewed as valuable resources for the mutual benefit of the school and the community.

Service learning was an important element in most schools. At Pacific, numerous volunteers assisted students and faculty members. Pacific enjoyed excellent support from businesses, service clubs, and social agencies. Students wanted to be involved in service activities in the community and showed a willingness to contribute to the welfare of others. School walls seemed to fade; community involvement was a natural and essential component of the school.

3. *Interdisciplinary team organization provides support and empowerment for teachers and students and creates a sense of ownership in the school's vision.*

Although interdisciplinary team organization was not a criterion for selecting the eight schools visited, all the schools had functioning teams in place. Daily schedules allowed large amounts of uninterrupted time for teacher teams to work with students. Indeed, flexible grouping was seen as necessary to accommodate the needs and interests of diverse groups of students. Teams and classes represented a cross-section of the school population.

Teachers valued the team concept and enjoyed working together. Interdisciplinary teams strengthened the instructional program, helped teachers focus on the learning needs of students, and facilitated flexibility. Teachers and students worked together to build a feeling of unity and belonging among their teammates.

Support and empowerment for teachers were evident in all schools. The interdisciplinary team organization provided teachers with opportunities to take risks and support each other's efforts. One teacher commented that "we take responsibility for our own and each others' learning by having teacher teams that plan interdisciplinary learning and provide assistance, support, and mentoring to each other and students." Teachers in these schools encouraged students to take risks and solve problems with the strong support of the teams. They encouraged students to be creative, to try new things, and to express their opinions.

4. *High academic and behavioral standards are necessary; all students can learn and conduct themselves appropriately. Students are unique in their developmental needs.*

During informal interviews, teachers at each school affirmed that "every student can learn." In these eight schools, staff members implemented this belief by providing success-oriented learning environments. All schools had exceptionally high academic standards for students.

Standards for student behavior were also high. A well-structured environment was provided for all students. No excuses were accepted for anti-social behavior. One principal said, "We hold students to high expectations and provide a consistent learning environment through school policies and class rules."

Support and empowerment for teachers were evident in all schools. The interdisciplinary team organization provided teachers with opportunities to take risks and support each other's efforts.

Trust and responsibility were consistent themes in these schools. Students were given responsibility and choices; they were asked to be participants in their own evaluation and they responded by developing plans for improvement. One teacher commented that "the adults in the building trust kids to be responsible and do good work, and the students respond by being responsible and doing their best work."

5. *Students learn more than academic content at school. Adult role modeling is important for students to learn self-esteem, social responsibility and skills, trust, and values. Caring must be pervasive.*

While these schools maintained academic rigor and consistently high behavioral standards, they did not apologize for their systematic attention to the affective growth and development of students. At Desert View, teachers affirmed that "our students perform as well-rounded, responsible, and productive persons. Our students are human beings first, students second."

How do students learn good citizenship, self-worth, and responsibility? It was clear that administrators, teachers, other school staff members, and parents believed in the necessity and power of serving as positive role models for students. A student was observed picking up a piece of paper without being asked. When the observer asked a teacher about this odd occurrence in a middle school, the response was that "they have such great respect for the custodian, they share her pride

in the school." Teachers served as role models for students in the classroom and by sponsoring different activities. Everyone observed seemed to work well with and enjoy helping students.

The deliberate teaching of civic values was evident in these schools. A typical statement of outcomes required students to demonstrate "a positive work ethic and the behaviors often associated with good citizenship such as reliability; responsibility; punctuality; regular attendance; self-respect; self-discipline; a respect for the dignity, worth, and property of others; and community service."

At each school, teaching good citizenship was just as important as teaching academics. Personalized education helped each learner become a productive member of the school. Service learning was an important vehicle for teaching citizenship and responsibility to society.

Adult role modeling and values instruction were unmistakable in these schools, but even more apparent was the pervasiveness of caring. Staff members were warm and friendly. The theme of caring surfaced in discussions with administrators, in leadership team meetings, with faculty members as a whole, and with students. Teachers demonstrated a sincere commitment to working with students, as evidenced by the frequent sharing of non-classroom time before and after school to tutor individuals and significant faculty efforts to manage student behavior.

During student interviews, comments similar to the following were made:

"We're a family here, people here care about you. Everybody is somebody in this school." "Adults care quite a bit about us. They call us by name. They are friendly, even the custodian, secretary, and cafeteria workers; you can talk to them." "We have the best set of teachers. They deserve an award for their dedication. They notice when you are not feeling well. They help you a lot."

6. *A safe, clean, orderly environment has a positive effect on learning.*

Some of the buildings we visited were old, yet cleanliness and a pleasant atmosphere were obvious. The building, grounds, and facilities were kept clean and in good repair. Evident in each school were pride in the physical plant, an attractive building, suitable furnishings in the office and lounge, and timely repairs and additions.

Physical and emotional safety were other top priorities. Generally, the eight campuses were orderly and had an air of cheerfulness. Students proceeded from class to class without unnecessary delay, interacted positively with adults, and showed a concern for meeting behavioral expectations. Faculty members helped maintain this atmosphere by being visible on campus between classes, greeting and talking to students, and encouraging participation and positive behavior.

During interviews, students assured the researchers that their schools were safe. "Someone is always watching you; they supervise us everywhere and they are always talking about us."

7. *An activity-centered/problem-based curriculum and instructional activities provide relevance for students and a vehicle for integration. Young adolescents need more opportunities for exploration.*

Many of the teams within these schools were experimenting with interdisciplinary instruction and using larger blocks of time. Teams of teachers designed and implemented interdisciplinary learning units connecting various subject matter areas in highly relevant and active instructional activities. In an eighth grade language arts class, for example, students talked about the great

Depression, reported about interviews with grandparents, wrote stories about what students their age might have experienced, and read stories from and about that time period.

Curriculum content was theme-based and the final student products enabled teachers to assess students' achievement of specified outcomes. A teacher at Maple Grove stated, "I have been teaching 11 years. In the past 5 years, I have gone from being a social studies teacher to being a teacher. With the core concept, I'm a better, more well-rounded teacher. I'm more flexible, more relaxed, and more effective as a teacher."

Instruction in these schools tended to be activity-based and relevant to students. Pacific offered students a "Design Your Own Unit" option. Students chose a topic to study, formed questions they wanted answered, and developed activities to demonstrate their achievement of each outcome. They worked alone or in groups and maintained a learning log of their progress toward each outcome. Assessment included peer, teacher, and self-assessment of products. Students were encouraged to reflect on their experiences and relate school experiences to their lives.

> Adult role modeling and values instruction were unmistakable in these schools, but even more apparent was the pervasiveness of caring. Staff members were warm and friendly.

A unit on polymers, for example, used silly putty to help students understand how conditions can affect them. This was real science and students were doing the work of real scientists. They wore goggles and aprons, mixed chemicals, manipulated materials, and investigated properties. There was an atmosphere of authenticity.

8. *The process of learning (learning to learn, critical thinking, technology) is more important than specific content to ensure success in high school and beyond. Authentic and self-assessments are important components of the learning process.*

All schools emphasized learning to learn abilities and thinking skills and treated technology as a tool rather than an end in itself. Students were taught responsible applications of technology to solve problems, gather information, and assist in everyday life. The prevailing view in these schools was that technology should be integrated throughout the curriculum.

Writing across the curriculum was evident in most schools. At one school, students entering sixth grade were expected to be familiar with narrative and informative styles of writing. By eighth grade, the district's writing assessment measured students' persuasive and informative writing skills. Grammar and spelling were taught in conjunction with writing. Rubrics (specific criteria for effective writing) were used for individual and peer editing and for assessment.

The visitation teams observed authentic and self-assessments and students setting and evaluating their own goals. In a technology education class, for example, students were working to com-

plete a bridge they had designed on the computer. Students prepared weekly goal sheets and stated what outcomes they would achieve each week. One evaluation required that the bridge survive a stress test.

Assessment processes focused on students' production of real work in both academic and social domains. Evidence for assessment was gathered from such sources as projects, portfolios, observations, and teacher-made tests. Team, teacher, and student-devised assessments were used.

❑ Arriving at Assumptions

Schools were asked how they arrived at their assumptions. Responses fell into two categories: professional experience, and development of knowledge. The most common basis was experience and sharing that experience. Having their own adolescent children, getting to know kids, watching the dramatic changes in students through the years, and listening to teachers' stories about what goes on in their classes were most often mentioned as ways the educators formulated assumptions. An underlying dedication of teachers and administrators to young adolescents was central to the formulation.

A second basis for assumptions was the development of knowledge. Important factors in helping schools develop and maintain their basic assumptions were cited as discussing issues, visiting other schools, reviewing literature and research, and staff development.

When asked if these assumptions were different from those held five years ago, most teachers and administrators said no; instead, assumptions had been adapted and modified, but not changed. Changes reflected an affirmation of "teaching kids rather than what to teach kids." Some teachers mentioned that the process had changed, but not the major assumptions. Teachers from one school, however, said that learning to work with a more diverse population had challenged some of their long-held assumptions.

When asked if the current assumptions were likely to change in the next five years, most answered no. The sense was "as we respond to the needs of kids and society, the assumptions won't change, but the processes will."

❑ Driving the Restructuring Process

Respondents were asked to explain how their assumptions "drove" their plans for restructuring. Teachers reported that the assumptions forced them to be more accommodating to the needs of young adolescents. As one Southland teacher said, "we want to do what is best for kids, even though it may be uncomfortable for the staff." A teacher from Heartland said it succinctly: "Our assumptions formed the basis for our thinking."

❑ Sharing the Assumptions

Staff members in each of the schools said school personnel, parents, and community members shared their assumptions. Teachers indicated that "decisions are made by the group, so even if some may not always agree with the decisions, everyone was involved and had the opportunity to be heard." "Our assumptions are pervasive. We hire staff who support our beliefs."

Community members showed support for the schools and their basic assumptions by buying homes in that school zone, passing budget overrides, volunteering time in schools, and creating business partnerships.

No one mentioned any strong opposition to the assumptions. Schools indicated that when opposition arose, talk, discussion, open door policies, information, articles—educating people—all seemed to diffuse opposition. One Pacific teacher said, "we talk about things; if there is understanding, there is support."

Summary

Collaboration and consensus created a community of learners in these eight site-visit schools. Major assumptions included community involvement, interdisciplinary team organization, high standards, a safe environment, social values, and adults as positive role models. Curriculum and instruction were activity-based and relevant to the lives of students. The process of learning and emphasis on learning to learn were more important than specific content. Learning and assessment were becoming more authentic.

Professional experience and the sharing of ideas were the major vehicles for arriving at and sharing the assumptions of the school. Strong belief in these assumptions seemed to evolve over time through discussion and collaboration. When assumptions were challenged, teachers and administrators were open to discussion. The assumptions of each of these schools seemed to drive their restructuring efforts.

Chapter 5

Desired Student Outcomes for Restructuring

When educators take a wider view of what students need to know as adults, the list generally does not include facts specific to any subject area. Educators and parents usually want students to understand technology; have a sense of community; and have the ability to communicate, to solve problems, and to cooperate with others. In those schools and school districts that have given thoughtful consideration to student outcomes, every resource, every plan and tactic, every learning activity and assessment, and every school improvement strategy is geared to supporting successful student outcomes.

Of the eight schools in this study, seven had developed generic student outcomes. These student outcomes will be discussed in this chapter. Ways in which school personnel identified and sought support for the outcomes will be presented as well as evidence for their support.

❑ Desired Student Outcomes

As might be expected, the format of student outcomes varied from school to school. Some schools were very detailed about what students must do to demonstrate a particular knowledge, skill, or attitude. Each general outcome was supported by four to six subordinate or enabling outcomes. Other schools listed only the generic outcomes, leaving the mode of implementation entirely to teachers.

Figure 5.1 summarizes the generic outcomes of the seven site-visit schools that actually made them available. The listing includes 37 broad outcomes. Only 5 outcomes received multiple listing:

- Critical thinking/problem solving skills (6 schools)
- Communication skills (4 schools)
- Responsible citizenship/work ethic/moral code (4 schools)
- Personal/life goals (2 schools)
- Active/self-directed learners (2 schools).

Some schools developed subordinate or enabling outcomes for their generic outcomes. For example, Heartland's third generic outcome, "Students will be effective communicators," included six enabling outcomes:

1. Read and evaluate a variety of materials
2. Write clearly and accurately for various audiences and purposes
3. Comprehend and evaluate oral communication

FIGURE 5.1

Desired Student Outcomes (School Design Statements)

Mountain View

Our graduates should have:

An understanding of a common core of subjects and skills

Self-esteem and healthy lifestyles

Interpersonal communication skills

Goals or directions for life

Reasoning and thinking skills to enable effective decision making

Appreciation for life-long learning

Respect and appreciation for others

An understanding of how to learn and apply knowledge

An appreciation for the fine arts and literature

A sense of integrity and moral conduct.

Lone Star

Each student will:

Improve critical thinking skills

Participate in at least one school activity annually

Demonstrate skills in setting and evaluating personal goals

Demonstrate growth in each course

Demonstrate responsible citizenship and good character

Desert View

Desert View Middle School students:

Perform as well-rounded, responsible, and productive persons

Apply creative and critical problem solving and thinking skills in individual and group settings

Gather and process information and communicate effectively

Incorporate knowledge of the world with an understanding of their place in it

Apply the scientific process to inquire and learn about themselves and their environment

Utilize an array of technological resources and tools.

Pacific

Personal Development

1. Communication
2. Wellness
3. Organizational skills, study skills, goal planning
4. Technology

Critical Thinking

1. Problem solving
2. Analysis
3. Integrated thinking

Interdependence

1. Social interaction
2. Civic responsibility
3. Global/environment

continued

4. Speak effectively with various audiences and purposes
5. Use and understand non-verbal communication
6. Use a variety of technologies to communicate.

In a similar vein, Metro's "Social Skills" generic outcome incorporated the following subcategories:

- Work cooperatively in both small and large groups
- Organize time and materials effectively and consistently

FIGURE 5.1 (continued)

Desired Student Outcomes (School Design Statements)

Maple Grove

Students demonstrate the intellectual skills and knowledge necessary to thrive in a changing world. These include basic knowledge and information; information processing; problem solving; knowledge about how to learn; higher order thinking skills; creativity; reflection and thoughtfulness.

Students demonstrate the responsible application of technology to solve problems, gather information, and assist in everyday life.

Students demonstrate a positive work ethic and the behaviors often associated with good citizenship, including reliability; responsibility; punctuality; regular attendance; self-respect; self-discipline; a respect for dignity, worth, and property of others; and community service.

Students take ownership and are actively involved in their own learning. They function as active workers and team members, while teachers, parents, and community members serve as mentors, instructors, coaches, facilitators, and guides.

Metro

Students will perform all the following competencies:

I. Research and Problem-Solving Skills
   A. Apply the Scientific Method
   B. Conduct research

II. Communication Skills
   A. Reading and listening
   B. Expression (speaking, writing, and performing)

III. Social Skills
   A. Work cooperatively in both small and large groups
   B. Organize time and materials effectively and consistently
   C. Complete assignments on time
   D. Explain and take responsibility for actions and accept consequences.

Heartland

A. Students will be continuously developing individuals.
B. Students will be self-directed learners.
C. Students will be effective communicators.
D. Students will be critical, creative thinkers and problem solvers.
E. Students will be responsible, contributing citizens.
F. Students will be creative contributors.
G. Students will be responsible stewards.
H. Students will be quality producers.

- Complete assignments on time
- Explain and take responsibility for actions and accept consequences.

In outcomes-based education terms, most of these outcomes were transitional or transformational. Transitional outcomes are usually defined as "broad, often higher-order competencies and orientations that cut across or exist independently of specific subject matter content and programs." Transformational outcomes are "culminating exit role performances...in contexts that at least simulate life situations and challenges (Spady and Marshall, 1991). Transitional outcomes link various kinds of content in integrated curricula and assessment. Transformational outcomes focus on the real life environments students are likely to encounter in the future. Usually only four to six exit outcomes are identified but there may be 5–10 enabling objectives for each. Typical exit outcomes are "self-directed learners," "effective communicators," "quality producers" (intellectual, artistic, physical products), etc.

❑ Identifying Appropriate Student Outcomes

Teachers and administrators were asked how they identified outcomes. Typical processes were faculty discussion; articulation sessions between elementary, middle, and high schools; and coordination with school districts. One school reported that it "started working on vision and ended up writing outcomes." Teachers reported that outcomes were identified during strategic planning, mission planning, and development of the school's action plan. Schools reported working with advisory councils, holding town meetings, and getting business input and feedback.

When asked how they knew the identified outcomes were appropriate, teachers and administrators relied mostly on professional insight and collective experience. Discussion, conferences, workshops, reading, and listening to experts all contributed to educators' knowledge of early adolescent development and dynamics. They trusted their instincts. They also relied on research studies about young adolescents and on visits to other effective schools.

❑ Achieving Outcomes

Teachers and administrators were asked how they would know when students had achieved the desired outcomes. The schools that had spent the most time clarifying and articulating outcomes also seemed to use more authentic assessment procedures. Systematic assessment procedures that schools mentioned included the following:

- Observations and interviews
- Portfolios
- Tests and test-like measures
- Demonstrations
- Student projects
- Student exhibitions
- Team analyses.

Many of the teachers mentioned less formal and indirect measures, including:

- Reading about students in the newspaper
- Seeing student enthusiasm for learning, their willingness to participate
- Getting feedback from graduates
- Reviewing data regarding student attendance, behavior, and self-discipline
- Speaking with parents
- Reviewing reports from high school teachers.

❑ Support for Outcomes

Respondents were asked during the interviews to cite evidence that staff members, parents, students, and community members supported their identified student outcomes.

Among faculty members, prime evidence of support were consensus building sessions, teachers trying new things and receiving feedback, and positive teacher attitudes. To ensure support, teachers collaborated in identifying outcomes.

Teachers cited parental comments, letters from parents and community members, and the number of people attending school events as confirmation of parent and community support.

Cooperation, enthusiasm, and a decrease in the frequency of the question "Why are we doing this?" were mentioned as evidence that students supported identified outcomes.

Summary

Schools that had invested real time in identifying outcomes showed consistency between stated learner outcomes and actual practice. Authentic assessment was used more in schools with clearly stated learner outcomes. Outcomes were identified primarily through extended discussion. School staff members relied principally on their insight as professionals and their collective experience to choose developmentally appropriate outcomes. Systematic discussion resulted in broad support for the outcomes from teachers, administrators, parents, and students.

Chapter 6

Processes for Developmentally Appropriate Restructuring

This chapter describes the restructuring processes that the eight site-visit schools used to be developmentally responsive to students. These descriptions include: the decision to restructure (how decided and who was involved); the developmentally appropriate processes (how determined and who was involved); the processes of restructuring as written policy (involvement in writing and approval and/or endorsement procedures); strategies for implementation; and evidence of the success of the restructuring efforts.

These descriptions are drawn from leadership team and teacher group structured interviews and *School Design Statements.*

The Decision To Restructure

The decision to restructure the school, the processes used to make that decision, and involvement in the decision-making process are the most basic considerations in the commitment to restructuring.

When asked if they had "consciously determined that restructuring was appropriate" for their schools, the leadership teams of all eight schools responded positively. Four teams cited the role of the principal in making the decision. Typical comments were, "It took a lot of talking and convincing," "The principal's leadership helped establish expectations," and "School leadership suggests changes and the staff tends to support their ideas." Leadership team members from the other schools mentioned the importance of communication, faculty advisory groups, and interdisciplinary teams in influencing the decision to restructure.

The five teacher groups responding to this question affirmed a conscious decision to restructure. Two groups reported strong administrative support. One group described the principal's commitment to the Carnegie Report, *Turning Points*, while another

group recognized the principal's leadership in establishing expectations. Teacher groups also mentioned "discussions about issues of importance to the middle level school," "recognition of a need to change," and "community forums" as strongly influencing their decision to begin restructuring.

❑ Processes Used To Determine the Need To Restructure

Leadership team and teacher group members from four schools identified their principal's participation as an important determinant in the decision to restructure. Typical comments were, "We felt the need and it was supported and encouraged by the principal," "The principal brought vision to a faculty that had high readiness,' "The principal and existing staff developed consensus," and "The principal promoted the change." Other processes reported by leadership teams and teacher groups included: "meetings, ideas, discussions, and pilot programs," "an evolving process of study—study of *Turning Points*," "studies about early adolescents," "searching for answers validated by research," "teacher consensus," and "recognition of a need for change." Also mentioned were the regional accreditation process, changing circumstances (e.g., going from a small to large school), training in processes and consensus development, and school-based inquiry.

❑ Involvement in the Decision To Restructure

The final question explored in this context was "Who was involved in determining that restructuring was appropriate for this school?" Members of leadership teams and teacher groups reported that teachers (middle level and high school), administrators (building level and central office), parents, consultants, and, in some cases, students were involved. One school reported an outside grant that specified the nature and number of participants in the decision-making process. Several schools described those involved in the decision as members of an organized group such as a strategic planning committee, a faculty advisory council, or some other type of school/parent council. In two schools, interdisciplinary teams strongly influenced the decision to restructure.

It was evident from the data that participation in the decision to restructure was open to virtually anyone who was interested.

Processes Used To Achieve Developmentally Appropriate Restructuring

In this section we will discuss the processes selected for developmentally appropriate restructuring, the procedures used to determine them, and those involved in the determination.

The seven schools that completed the *School Design Statement* reported some form of participatory decision making (Figure 6.1). Processes varied from highly structured procedures such as faculty councils and school improvement teams to informal communication networks and consensus procedures.

The most sophisticated procedure described in the *School Design Statements* was from Pacific Middle School. Although their district had a comprehensive middle school improvement plan, the Pacific staff members, students, parents, and community members went further to develop a collab-

FIGURE 6.1

Processes Used To Achieve Developmentally Appropriate Restructuring (School Design Statements)

Desert View

Teacher/Administrator Committees:

1. Discipline Policies
2. Duty Schedules
3. Curricular Implementation
4. Budget Allocations
5. Department and Team Concerns

These committees determine success of current programs, program revisions, and nature of inservice

Involved in district School-Centered Decision Making Project

Heartland

Principal as prime instructional leader

Faculty Advisory Council:

1. Forum for grievances
2. Addresses suggestions for school and program improvement

Lone Star

School Improvement Team:

1. Streamlines, delineates, clarifies decision-making process
2. Establishes a collaborative network of educational partners
3. Outlines appropriate levels of decision making, enhances morale, promotes time management, encourages school-community involvement and support, creates a sense of support, and utilizes available resources

Maple Grove

Collaborative decision making

Standing Committees:

1. Staff Development
2. Program Advisory
3. Technology

Metro

Interim Governance Council:

1. Consensus decision making
2. Decision making guided by the Nine Common Principles and Habits of the Mind and Heart (Coalition of Essential Schools)

Mountain View

Instructional leadership by principal

Collaborative efforts with:

1. Mentor Teacher Program
2. Curriculum Chairs
3. Student Council Sponsor

Emphasis on consensus

Pacific

Participatory management with multiple opportunities for staff participation in informal and formal decision making

21st Century Council (primary decision-making body at the school):

1. Develops school plan for the year
2. Coordinates activities of Network Committee (restructuring), Student Council, Crisis Team, Staff Committees, Team Leaders, and Parent Communication Committee

District Middle School Improvement Process Committee

orative governance model. At the center of the model is the 21st Century Council composed of teachers, non-certified staff members, parents, students, and community members. The Council develops the yearly plan for the school and coordinates the activities of the following committees:

1. Network Committee—Restructuring
2. Team Leaders—Three Teams
3. Student Council
4. Parent Communication Committee
5. Crisis Team
6. Staff Committees for
   - Technology
   - Social/Wellness
   - Talented and Gifted (TAG)
   - Volunteers.
   - Library Advisory
   - Safety
   - Awards

This governance structure clarifies the committees' purposes, eligibility for membership, and operating procedures.

In the structured interviews, leadership team and teacher group members reported various processes used to achieve restructuring. These can be conceptualized in seven categories: problem-solving processes, faculty council/leadership team processes, staff development processes, administrative processes, team processes, district processes, and informal processes (Figure 6.2).

Leadership team members from Lone Star and Desert View and teacher group members from Desert View and Heartland reported sequential strategies used in restructuring. The sequences typically included identifying the problem, conducting surveys, finding solutions, trying something, evaluating, and modifying.

Leadership teams from Pacific and Heartland and teacher groups from Lone Star, Desert View, Pacific, Southland, and Heartland reported some type of faculty governance council, strategic planning committee, or school improvement team. Two or more groups mentioned staff development and administrative processes.

The leadership team at Desert View and teacher groups at Lone Star, Maple Grove, and Southland cited the impact of interdisciplinary teams and/or core teams on the process of restructuring. The leadership team at Pacific and teacher groups at Lone Star, Pacific, and Southland reported district initiatives such as districtwide middle school plans, curriculum support, support networks, and program evaluation.

Informal processes such as faculty meetings, "principal bouncing ideas off teachers," "communication, conversation," "willingness to change when needed," and "teacher lounge discussions," were reported by one leadership team (Metro) and three teacher groups (Lone Star, Desert View, Southland).

Involvement and collaboration were the foundations on which problem solving, school governance, staff development, team operation, and informal decision making were based.

FIGURE 6.2

Processes Used To Achieve Developmentally Appropriate Restructuring—Leadership Teams and Teacher Groups

Problem-Solving Processes

Identify problems, look for a solution, try something, evaluate, and involve a lot of people

Discussion, surveys, tentative proposal, discussion of concerns, modifications

Explore, pilot, build on idea, expand, becomes standard procedure

Suggestions from faculty or administration to Faculty Advisory Council

Faculty members go to department chair, administrator, or Faculty Advisory Council

Appear before Faculty Advisory Council

Faculty Councils

Faculty advisory committee

Strategic planning committee

School improvement team

Site council

Volunteer design committees

Teacher committees

Various committees

Staff Development

Conferencing/Networking

Staff development time—internal/external

Training and sharing instructional ideas

Teachers visit other schools

Teachers attend conferences

Teachers read professional publications

Sharing information from conferences and school visits

Administrative Processes

Administrative team meets every Monday

Department chairs' meeting

Faculty/staff meetings

Goal setting

Team Processes

Teams explore possibilities, study proposals

Teachers meet in teams for continuous improvement

Teams facilitate sharing and implementation

Teams change programs individually—unilaterally

District Processes

District middle school plan

District initiatives

District curriculum support

District support networks and evaluation

Informal Processes

Faculty meetings/discussions, pro and con

Teacher has idea and/or principal calls a meeting

Teacher lounge discussions

Principal bounces ideas off teachers

Informal, as needed

"We just do it"

Individual creativity

Willing to change procedures and practices whenver needed

❑ Staff Involvement in the Decision To Restructure

When asked "How did you decide on the process to be used to achieve developmentally appropriate restructuring?" both leadership teams and teacher groups had difficulty determining what process they had used. The leadership team at Desert View believed that the administration had made the decision. The Desert View teacher group, however, said the decision was made "through consensus." At Pacific, "all decisions about processes were made by the staff." Those decisions, however, were influenced and at times determined by guidelines for grants.

Much decision making was informal. A member of a teacher group stated, "Formal committees have little impact. Restructuring has been precipitated by a felt need, tackled by groups of teachers looking for solutions." At Heartland, the decision about processes for restructuring "evolved from the principal," who supported a staff approaching restructuring with the attitude that "this is what's best for kids." At Lone Star, however, much of the informal decision making was initiated by the principal.

These eight schools believed in the importance of widespread participation and collaboration. Typical vehicles for involvement included "staff and strategic planning committee," "faculty, staff, parents, and community," "faculty advisory committee, staff, and administration," "anyone who wished to be involved," "and teachers involved in every aspect."

Restructuring Processes– Written Document or Policy

Three questions are addressed in this section. Is the restructuring process written as policy? Who wrote the policy statement (if one exists), and who is responsible for approving or endorsing the policy?

❑ Written Document or Policy

When asked, "Is the process for restructuring written as policy?" leadership teams and teacher groups from three schools answered "yes," three schools answered "no," and two schools did not respond. At Pacific Middle School, written policy was influenced by guidelines and procedures specified in grants that the school received to restructure and by the guidelines of the district's middle school restructuring plan. This *Middle School Improvement Process: An Action Plan* identifies eight essential components:

1. A strong core curriculum
2. Exploratory, elective, and cocurricular opportunities
3. Small communities of learning
4. Interdisciplinary teaching
5. Advisory programs
6. Site-based accountability
7. Community involvement
8. Staff prepared and committed to working with young adolescents.

To enable schools to restructure around these essential components, *The Action Plan* proposes objectives and activities in five goal areas: curriculum and instruction, school environment, staff development, communications, and operations. Within the framework of this district plan, the Pacific Middle School developed its own restructuring document, the *Building Level Plan*, managed by its 21st Century Council. Similarly, Metro Middle School formulated a renewal plan and Heartland prepared operational guidelines for the Faculty Advisory Committee.

Of the three schools reporting no written restructuring policy, the Lone Star teacher group said that their restructuring was "dictated by strong leadership." At Maple Grove the leadership team acknowledged a "need for a formal design statement developed by the entire faculty and school community." Leadership team members at Desert View Middle School thought the documents for the National Secondary School Recognition Program or the Campus Improvement Team might indeed be their written policy.

❑ Involvement in Written Restructuring Policy

The leadership team at Pacific reported that involvement in writing restructuring policy was situational. Different forms of involvement were required at various times. The other schools said, however, that involvement in writing was generally open to everyone through participation in various school, district, and community committees. At Heartland, both the leadership team and the teacher group said the restructuring policy was originally written by the principal. The faculty now participates in revision through the Faculty Advisory Committee.

❑ Endorsement or Approval of Restructuring Policy

Endorsement of the School Renewal Plan at Metro is pending, a process the leadership team describes as "very bureaucratic." At Heartland, the policy has been endorsed by the staff members. Pacific has several levels of endorsement including the building level, those who approve restructuring grants, the school district through its middle school improvement program, and the board of education. The building-level restructuring policy (*Building Level Plan*) is endorsed by the staff members, the principal, and the school site council (21st Century Council).

Strategies for Implementing Restructuring

A variety of strategies were used to implement school restructuring. Governance groups such as strategic planning committees and faculty advisory committees planned and coordinated along with interdisciplinary and core teams. Faculty members participated through meetings (both informal and formal) and small group and whole-faculty consensus.

"Be sure people are educated," the Heartland leadership team suggested. This sentiment was echoed by other school groups in such implementation strategies as "adequate staff development," "middle school conferences," "look at other districts," and "inservice." Climate factors ("reinforce a safe, risk-taking environment") were also mentioned. A positive environment was advanced as a critical supporting factor.

The strategies for implementation that five schools identified showed evidence of a systematic approach. Lone Star and Desert View reported specific decision making and implementation

strategies. Systematic strategies (Figure 6.3) typically included identifying the problem (discussion, surveys, needs), looking for solutions (tentative proposals, determining trade-offs, discussion pro and con), doing a pilot (trying out an idea, doing it in small increments), evaluating (getting feedback, continual assessment), modifying, and expanding. A systematic approach was also apparent, but to a lesser degree, at Southland where the leadership team emphasized school plan-

FIGURE 6.3

Strategies for Implementation—Systematic Procedures

Desert View

Leadership Team

Discussions
Surveys
Tentative proposal
Discussion of pros and cons
Modifications

Teacher Group

Need
Process
Try out
Inservice
Expand

Heartland

Leadership Team

Be sure people are educated
Reinforce safe risk-taking environment
Get feedback
Continual assessment

Teacher Group

Faculty Advisory Committee
Whole faculty consensus

Lone Star

Leadership Team

Identify problem
Look for a solution
Do a pilot
Evaluate
Try someting, evaluate, and involve a lot of people

Teacher Group

Principal has idea—stimulates faculty
Problem solving comes from the faculty—when we see a need, we try to meet it
Strategic Planning Committee

Pacific

Leadership Team

Processing skills
Communication skills
Do it in small increments

Teacher Group

Determine trade-offs—restructuring requires that some things must be given up

Southland

Leadership Team

Local school planning for implementation
Evaluation
Modify

Teacher Group

N/A

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ning and the need to evaluate and modify. The Heartland leadership team also argued for the importance of "feedback" and "continual assessment." At Pacific, with strong commitment to systematic decision making and problem solving, the leadership team identified "processing skills" and "communication skills" as critical elements in their successful implementation.

Evidence of Successful Restructuring

The evidence of successful restructuring in the eight site-visit schools can be summarized under School Environment, School Programs, School Change, and Impact on Students. (See Figure 6.4).

The school environments revealed a strong feeling of pride, support, communication, and "closeness." Typical statements made during interviews were "genuine love of students and each other," "involvement," "staff wants to work together," and "a complete staff of teachers who are supportive and feel good." These collegial beliefs and attitudes are strong indicators of successful restructuring.

Both leadership teams and teacher groups identified several new programs they had developed. These restructured programs included teaming, reading programs based on learning styles, advisory groups, technology, student activities, school/community partnerships, and use of portfolios.

> The restructuring process in these schools could be characterized as collaborative, deliberate, organized, and comprehensive.

They also cited as evidence of restructuring, faculty, staff member, parent, and community attitudes toward the process of change, with such statements as "it's a good feeling to be part of change," "almost all staff is supportive of change," "people willing to change," and "schoolwide support of change."

Less evidence of successful restructuring was noted in the actual impact on students. One school mentioned higher student grades, another cited a good attendance rate in spite of a changing population, and two schools mentioned fewer discipline problems.

Undoubtedly, efforts in these schools will have greater impact on students in the future, since most of the schools are still in the initial stages of restructuring. New programs are now being introduced and teachers, parents, and community members are getting used to new ways of doing things. The best is yet to come.

Summary

The *decision to restructure* was a conscious decision in each of the eight schools. *Processes that guided the decision to restructure* included principal encouragement and support; meetings of teams and teacher groups to discuss, study, and "search for answers validated by research"; teacher consensus; and a recognition of a need for change. *Involvement* was widespread and included just about anyone who wanted to participate.

Processes used to achieve restructuring ranged from systematic procedures for change and decision making to informal processes such as teacher discussions, sharing of information, and principal "seed planting." Restructuring procedures most commonly identified by both leadership teams and teacher groups included problem solving, faculty councils, staff development, administrative processes, team processes, district processes, and informal processes. In most cases, *decisions about processes used to achieve restructuring* were made by the faculty and staff members through "consensus," by principal initiative, by guidelines required by restructuring grants and district improvement plans, and by informal discussions. Widespread *participation and collaboration* were evident.

FIGURE 6.4

Evidence of Successful Restructuring

School Environment

We are a closer faculty—break down barriers and become closer

We have a complete staff of teachers who are supportive and feel good

Amount of involvement

The staff here wants to work together—that's what it is all about

A real genuine love of students and each other

The success of previous change makes the change easier

Being recognized as an award-winning school (National Recognition Program) brings confirmation and pride

Seeing needs and working on things as groups

Opportunities after school to get training

Positive feeling/climate in the school

School Programs

Reading enrichment because of learning styles program

Teaming

Advisory classes

Heterogeneous grouping

Learning labs

Computers

Technology throughout the school

Appropriate activities

Success of school/community library program

Seventh grade teaming

Writing across the content areas

Ninth grade portfolios

Teams have more responsibility for discipline; less for administrators

School Change

Morale—it's a good feeling to be part of change

Almost all staff is supportive of restructuring

We've always been close to being a "true" middle school...but we're even closer to being a "great" middle school

See change occur—see people willing to change

Schoolwide support of change

Impact on Students

Higher percentage of students making good grades

Discipline problems are down significantly

Still have good average daily attendance rate—even with a more difficult student population

The "process of restructuring" was a *written document or policy* in only three of the schools. *Involvement* in writing the policies was generally open to everyone through various committees. *Approval or endorsement* of restructuring policies in some cases came from boards of education or grant-giving agencies. For the most part, however, restructuring processes or policies, whether written or unwritten, were endorsed by each school's staff members, administrators, parents, and community members.

A variety of *strategies were used in restructuring,* including strategic planning committees, school improvement teams, faculty advisory committees, interdisciplinary/core teams, and small group and faculty consensus. Staff development and climate factors were also cited. Five schools used systematic procedures for implementation.

Evidence of successful restructuring was reported under the categories of school environment, school programs, school change, and impact on students. Evidence of successful restructuring was most often cited under school environment and school programs. The impact of school restructuring on students was less than might have been anticipated.

The restructuring process in these schools could be characterized as collaborative, deliberate, organized, and comprehensive. Schools emphasized school climates that would support collaborative decision making in formal and informal settings. Principals were key players in creating appropriate support systems, in establishing processes, and in sharing visions. Teachers spoke of being supported, were open to new ideas, were tuned to the needs of young adolescents, and were comfortable with the ongoing processes of change.

Chapter 7

Status of Middle Level Restructuring

The participants in the restructuring sample for this study (n = 25) were carefully selected from successfully restructuring middle level schools in the United States. Nominations for participating schools and principals were sought from persons judged to be knowledgeable about middle level education in their states. Each nomination included evidence of success on eight criteria of restructuring developed by NASSP's ad hoc Commission on School Restructuring.

Nominations were reviewed by NASSP staff and members of the research team. Confirmed nominees were asked to complete a Principal Survey and to collect data on 34 school and district variables using NASSP's Comprehensive Assessment of School Environments (CASE) battery of instruments. Only those principals who completed these initial tasks were considered for the study. In addition, each of the eight schools chosen for site visits was asked to complete NASSP's School Design Statement. Final selection of site-visit schools was based on strengths and/or anomalies detected in the nomination forms, principal surveys, and CASE-IMS profiles. The research team believes the 25 restructuring schools in the sample are highly representative of all American schools engaged in systematic restructuring.

This second phase of the National Study of Leadership in Middle Level Education focused on the final three research questions listed in the introduction to this report.

5. Describe programs and leaders in schools that are restructuring successfully.
6. Contrast the programs and leadership of successfully restructuring schools with those of the typical random sample of middle level schools.
7. Identify trends in middle level education and leadership that will assist educators in the implementation of quality middle level schools for the next century.

This chapter summarizes the major findings related to each of these questions and discusses the status of restructuring in contemporary middle level schools.

Program and Leader Characteristics

Findings for this question are summarized under demographics, leadership, mission, vision, assumptions and beliefs, learner outcomes, and restructuring processes.

❑ Demographics

- Schools of the restructuring sample, including site-visit schools, were located in all geographic regions of the country and in metropolitan, suburban, and rural environments.
- Schools ranged in size from fewer than 200 to more than 1,300 students.
- The schools were representative of typical grade patterns and organizational arrangements.

❑ Leadership

- The principals of these schools were relatively young and well-educated.
- All but one school had a leadership team of teachers and administrators to assist in the planning and operation of the school.
- No pattern emerged of independent decision making by faculty.
- Principals enjoyed relative autonomy in personnel decisions and at least some latitude in budget allocation.
- Parents participated actively in these schools, both in a planning/advising capacity and in the operation of curricular and cocurricular programs.

❑ Mission

School mission statements emphasized the needs of young adolescents, supportive school cultures, learning for the future, academic and learning skills, and collaborative processes.

❑ Vision

- The visions of the eight site-visit schools focused on the needs of the young adolescents they served. These visions were developed in collegial environments, with parental and community involvement.
- The *personal* visions of leadership team members and teacher groups influenced the school visions. Personal visions extended to safe and nurturing environments, school organization, developmental appropriateness, relevant learning experiences, skill development, learning for the future, creativity, and technology.
- The *school* visions emphasized student developmental needs and specific strategies such as curriculum integration, block scheduling, interdisciplinary teaming, and organizational restructuring.
- Major factors that influenced the development of school visions were an emphasis on process, supportive school cultures, the leadership of principals, and staff development.
- Administrators, teachers, students, parents, and community members strongly supported these visions of middle level schooling.

❑ Assumptions and Beliefs

- The eight site-visit schools created communities of learning based on beliefs and assumptions shared through professional experience, discussion, and collaboration.
- Major philosophical, psychological, and organizational assumptions underlying school design and restructuring in these schools were the need for community involvement, interdisciplinary team organization, high standards, a safe school environment, strong social and civic values, and adults as role models.
- Assumptions and beliefs favored the process of learning and learning to learn rather than specific content.
- The assumptions held by each of the site-visit schools seemed to drive their restructuring efforts.

❑ Outcomes

- Schools relied mainly on the professional insight of staff members and their collective experience to choose developmentally appropriate student learning outcomes.
- Schools that invested real time in identifying student learning outcomes showed consistency between the stated outcomes and actual school practices.
- Systematic discussion resulted in broad support for learner outcomes as reported by administrators, teachers, students, and parents.
- Schools with clearly stated learner outcomes tended to use more authentic methods of assessment.

❑ Processes of Restructuring

- Principals were key players in the restructuring process, sharing visions, creating support systems, and establishing appropriate procedures.
- Teachers were open to new ideas and comfortable with the ongoing processes of change.
- Teacher groups participated in decision making about school restructuring with principals rather than on their own.
- The decision to restructure was a conscious decision in each of the site-visit schools.
- The processes used for restructuring in these schools ranged from systematic protocols for change and decision making to very informal processes such as teacher discussions and "seed planting" by principals.
- Typical strategies used for restructuring included planning and advisory committees, school improvement teams, interdisciplinary and core teams, group consensus techniques, staff development, and school climate improvement.
- Instructional strategies varied from sophisticated teaming approaches to the quite traditional.

Programs and Leadership Compared and Contrasted

This section summarizes the findings about the programs and leadership of the successfully restructuring site-visit schools in this study in relation to the national random sample collected in

1992 and the national normative sample for the Comprehensive Assessment of School Environments (CASE) battery of instruments.

❑ Middle Level Program Practices

Five practices are commonly endorsed today in the middle level literature as essential to the contemporary middle level model of schooling: teaming, exploratory courses, cocurricular programs, adviser-advisee arrangements, and intramural activities.

- The eight site-visit schools were significantly higher in their implementation of teaming, exploratory, and cocurricular practices than is typical of schools nationally.
- The schools were fairly typical in their implementation of adviser-advisee and intramural programs.

❑ Other Issues and Trends

- Principals' support of a 6–7–8 grade pattern for middle level schools and of articulation or program reasons for moving to that grade pattern were virtually identical to that of principals in the 1992 national survey.
- Technology use in these schools was very similar to that of schools nationally.
- Site-visit principals' beliefs about intramural programs vs. interscholastic athletics were representative of the national sample.
- These principals were generally in favor of some form of ability grouping, as was the 1992 national random sample.
- Principals' descriptions of the most important teacher skills and characteristics were typical of the national group.
- Principals' choices for the most important tasks of American schools were also typical.

> Five practices are commonly endorsed today in the middle level literature as essential to the contemporary middle level model of schooling: teaming, exploratory courses, cocurricular programs, adviser-advisee arrangements, and intramural activities.

❑ CASE-IMS Data

The NASSP Comprehensive Assessment of School Environments Information Management System (CASE-IMS) is a systematic data base for school planning and restructuring that includes information about 34 district and school variables. The battery of seven surveys profiles a school in terms of selected demographic characteristics, school inputs, mediating variables such as school climate, and six student outcomes. Six surveys were used in this study; the optional Parent Survey was omitted. Fourteen of the CASE-IMS variables were considered in depth in the selection and investigation of the site-visit schools. Significant CASE-IMS findings included:

- The average scores of the eight schools generally exceeded the national norms.
- The educational beliefs of site-visit principals were quite similar to those of other principals throughout the country.
- The degree of consistency between these principals and teachers on the importance of selected school goals was significantly greater than in the national normative group.
- The degree of difficulty associated with making changes in these schools was comparable to most other schools.
- Student achievement as measured by reading and mathematics scores tended to exceed the national average.
- Student disciplinary referrals were somewhat higher in five of the site-visit schools than in the normative sample, which included senior high and junior-senior high schools. This finding may be an artifact of this level of schooling since middle level teachers seem to refer more students than do high school teachers.
- The percentage of students passing all courses was higher than in the national normative group.
- Student (and teacher) views of these schools were generally more positive than is typical, as reflected in satisfaction and school climate scores.
- Students' belief in their ability to succeed were invariably higher than the national average.
- The holding power of these schools was generally very high; five of the eight schools reported that all students completed the school year.

Trends in Restructuring

A number of trends in middle level restructuring and leadership evident in this study can help educators implement quality schools for the 21st century.

❑ Planning

- Leadership teams cited the importance of principal leadership in the decision to restructure, as well as good communication, faculty advisory groups, and interdisciplinary teams.
- Involvement and collaboration were the bases for school problem solving, governance, staff development, team operation, and informal decision making.
- The majority of the site-visit schools used some type of systematic approach or set of strategies for implementing their restructuring plans.

❑ School Design

- School Design Statements invariably described current programs rather than a desired school of the future. The statements rarely included program specifications that could serve as a basis for longitudinal assessment.
- Six major factors influenced the development of school vision in the site-visit schools: specific processes for planning and involvement; positive school culture; principal leadership; identification of student, parent, and community needs; staff development; and defining values and beliefs.

- The concept of "community" was a persistent theme in the site-visit schools, coalescing around a set of common assumptions and beliefs for restructuring.

❑ Learning Environment

- All the site-visit schools created a safe, clean, and orderly environment as a *sine qua non* for successful learning. Teachers and students took pride in the physical appearance and atmosphere of their buildings.
- Adult role modeling was emphasized so students might learn self-esteem, social responsibility and skills, trust, and the values of good citizenship. Caring was pervasive in these schools.
- High academic and behavioral standards were established as the basis for success-oriented learning conditions for all students.
- Interdisciplinary teams empowered teachers and students and helped create a sense of ownership in the school vision.
- Team organization encouraged openness, risk taking, problem solving, and creativity.
- The site-visit schools emphasized theme-based curricula and activity-based instruction, with many opportunities for students to pursue authentic learnings.
- The process of learning was emphasized over specific content. Authentic and self-assessments were important components of the learning process.
- Only five categories of student outcomes received attention in more than one school: critical thinking or problem solving skills; communication skills; responsible citizenship, work ethic, or moral code; personal and life goals; and active, self-directed learners.

> Leadership remains the key to success. The need also exists to coordinate the efforts of various levels in the system. Only time will tell whether the current efforts constitute a critical mass for success.

Conclusions and Reflections

This study used multi-method analysis to investigate the complex issues of middle level school restructuring—its leadership and processes. Both quantitative and qualitative methods were used. Survey data collection and analysis were paired with field observations and structured interviews in an attempt to understand the "culture of restructuring" in real middle level schools. We collected quantitative data in a diagnostic fashion to guide our field work. In turn, we tried to quantify our field observations wherever possible.

The restructuring sample and site-visit schools have unique cultures that reflect the values, beliefs, and behaviors of the people who inhabit them. The outcomes of this kind of study are necessarily complex, idiosyncratic, and untidy. It is far easier to list the separate findings of such

a study than to synthesize any general conclusions, particularly if they are to represent distinct processes or patterns of organization.

Keeping these clarifications in mind, we can summarize the most significant conclusions of our investigation under two categories: change process and school restructuring. These conclusions assume that the restructuring and site-visit sample in this study is generally representative of middle level schooling in the United States today.

❑ Change Process

1. Schools are slow to change, particularly if the changes affect many parts of the system.
2. Since each school has a unique combination of conditions that influence change, it is inconceivable that any one school design might be introduced into all schools with the same degree of success.
3. Successful change of the scope of current restructuring initiatives demands that a school develop a local design statement, a comprehensive plan, and locate its efforts within the context of the larger system.
4. School administrators and staff members generally lack the experience and expertise to manage systematic change efforts that include a School Design Statement and a comprehensive change plan for the 21st century.
5. Comprehensive school change requires several years for initial implementation and a decade or more for significant institutionalization of the changes.

❑ School Restructuring

1. Middle level schools in the United States are committed to systematic, student-centered restructuring leading to school improvement.
2. The contemporary "middle level model," as expressed in Carnegie's *Turning Points* and in NASSP and NMSA reports, has widespread support but uneven implementation in American middle level schools.
3. Leadership from the principal remains a critical factor in school restructuring and improvement.
4. Leadership teams are fairly common in middle level schools but their composition and function vary widely.
5. Collaboration and consensus-based decision making are important strategies in successfully restructuring middle-level schools.
6. Middle level schools are striving to become learning communities with common agreement on the assumptions, processes, and outcomes that enhance student learning.
7. Success in school restructuring depends on the vision and insight of the local school design and the comprehensive plan for implementation.
8. Middle level schools are struggling to balance the cognitive and the affective in restructured learning environments.
9. Schools do not regularly review the educational literature or visit other successfully restructuring schools to frame their designs and plans for restructuring. Instead, they rely on the experience and insight of staff members.

10. Schools that use more systematic approaches to restructuring tend to be more successful and to implement more authentic methods of instruction and assessment.
11. Middle level schools exhibit limited agreement on the most important student learning outcomes. Only problem solving and communication skills have major support across schools.
12. Systematic restructuring efforts may improve student and teacher views of their schools, student beliefs in their ability to be successful, and the percentage of students passing all courses.
13. In general, middle level schools in the United States have not yet redesigned and restructured their existing programs.

This picture of restructuring in American middle level schools is clearly that of a work-in-progress. These schools need help in developing systematic local design statements, comprehensive plans for implementation, and the administrator and teacher skills to implement planned changes. Commitment to the task is present as well as notable good-will on the part of school administrators, teachers, students, parents, and the community.

Leadership remains the key to success. The need also exists to coordinate the efforts of various levels in the system. Only time will tell whether the current efforts constitute a critical mass for success.

References

Alexander, W. M., and McEwin, C. K. *Schools in the Middle: Status and Progress.* Columbus, Ohio: National Middle School Association, 1989.

Barth, R. S. *Improving Schools from Within.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1990.

Clark, S. N., and Clark, D. C. *Restructuring the Middle Level School: Implications for Middle Level Leaders.* Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York Press, in press.

Epstein, J. L., and Mac Iver, D. J. *Education in the Middle Grades: National Practices and Trends.* Columbus, Ohio: National Middle School Association, 1990.

Keefe, J. W.; Clark, D. C.; Nickerson, N. C.; and Valentine, J. *The Middle Level Principalship: Volume II; The Effective Middle Level Principal.* Reston, Va.: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1983.

Rock, D. A., and Hemphill, J. K. *The Junior High School Principalship.* Reston, Va.: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1966.

Spady, W. G., and Marshall, K. J. "Beyond Traditional Outcome-Based Education." *Educational Leadership,* October 1991.

Valentine, J., and Mogar, D. C. "Middle Level Certification, An Encouraging Evolution." *Middle School Journal,* November 1992.

Valentine, J. W.; Clark, D. C.; Irvin, J. L.; Keefe, J. W.; and Melton, G. *Leadership in Middle Level Education, Volume 1: A National Survey of Middle Level Leaders and Schools.* Reston, Va.: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1993.

Valentine, J.; Clark, D. C.; Nickerson, N. C., Jr.; and Keefe, J. W. *The Middle Level Principalship, Volume 1: A Survey of Middle Level Principals and Programs.* Reston, Va.: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1981.

Appendices

Appendix A: Nomination Materials

1. Nominators Rating Form
2. Initial Contact Letter
3. School Response Form

Appendix B: Data Collection Instruments (Pre-Visit)

1. Principal Survey
2. CASE-IMS Variable Descriptions

Appendix C: Selected Survey Data

1. Site-Visit and Restructuring Sample
2. Selected Demographic Characteristics of Site-Visit Sample, Restructuring Sample, and 1992 National Random Sample
3. Principal Survey Data for Restructuring Sample
4. Selected CASE-IMS Data for Restructuring Sample

Appendix D: Site-Visit Materials

1. Letter of Invitation
2. School Design Statement Form
3. Site-Visit Schedule
4. Site-Visit Team Members

Appendix E: Site-Visit Data Collection Instruments

1. School Background Information Form
2. Leadership Team Interview Form
3. Teacher Interview Form
4. Student Interview Form
5. Classroom Observation Form
6. Post-Observation Teacher Form
7. Student Shadow Form

Appendix A-:
Nominator Rating Form

Nominator's Name_____

Nominator's Telephone ( )_____

NASSP NATIONAL STUDY OF LEADERSHIP IN MIDDLE LEVEL EDUCATION

Phase II: Restructuring Middle Level Schools

NOMINATORS RATING FORM
(Please type or print)

Principal_____

School _____Grade Levels_____

School Address _____

City _____ _____State_____Zip_____

School Telephone ( )_____

The selection criteria below were adapted for this study by the Research Team from the NASSP Restructuring Commission Definition and Dimensions of school restructuring. You are asked to circle the number under each criterion that in your judgment most nearly reflects the implementation level of your nomination in that area of school restructuring. Higher numbers (i.e., 4 or 5) indicate a greater level of implementation. Please comment on each rating as appropriate. The summary rating at the end of the form is very important. We are interested in your broad perspective, the gestalt of your reasons for proposing the nomination.

Restructuring is defined as the reforming of school organizational interrelationships and processes to increase student learning and performance, with a focus on:

1. The quality of learning experiences and outcomes;
2. The professional role and performance of teachers;
3. Collaborative leadership and management;
4. Redefined and integrated curriculum;
5. Systematic planning and measurement of results;
6. Multiple learning sites and school schedules;
7. Coordination of community resources, human and fiscal;
8. Equity, fairness and inclusion for all students.

CRITERIA -- Rate your nomination on each restructuring criterion below by circling the appropriate number.

1. The quality of learning experiences and outcomes:
The school community believes that all students can be successful in school; students, staff and community hold high expectations for student learning and success; the school positively shapes the conditions under which students learn in the school.

1 2 3 4 5

Comments:

2. Professional role and performance of teachers:
Teacher culture is supportive and collegial; teachers have ownership of school improvement; teachers use a variety of instructional strategies based on student needs.

1 2 3 4 5

Comments:

3. Collaborative leadership and management:
Administrators and staff work together to provide leadership; innovative problem solving is encouraged and recognized; principals model instructional knowledge, skills, and abilities.

1 2 3 4 5

Comments:

4. Redefined and integrated curricula:
The curriculum is learner-centered rather than subject-centered; essential learnings are identified; both knowledge and application are planned products of the curriculum; the curriculum includes global, multi-cultural, cross cultural, and interdisciplinary perspectives.

1 2 3 4 5

Comments:

5. Systematic planning and measurement of results:
Goals and objectives are connected to the school vision and to evaluation in a continuously renewing process; a long range plan exists with opportunities for individual input and adjustment; cognitive and affective criteria and measures are utilized.

1 2 3 4 5

Comments:

6. Multiple learning sites and school schedules:
Multiple learning sites are utilized and connected by design and technology; school schedules are tailored to fit the type of learning experience and allow for variation in learning group and size.

1 2 3 4 5

Comments:

7. Coordination of community resources, human and fiscal:
Community and school personnel meet regularly to identify and coordinate services for students and their families and to provide extended-day opportunities for students; parents and schools act as partners in the educational process.

1 2 3 4 5

Comments:

8. Equity, fairness and inclusion for all students:
All students have access to all curricula and programs; varying learning styles are recognized and utilized in determining access to resources; budgets have student learning needs and differences as their primary focus.

1 2 3 4 5

Comments:

GENERAL SUMMARY -- Sum up your top two reasons for nominating this school and its principal:

Signature of Nominator

Nominator's School/Agency

Date

Location

Appendix A-2
Initial Contact Let'

July 10, 1992

Dear :

The National Association of Secondary School Principals is conducting a study of middle level schools and principals (grades 5-9) to update the national database on the principalship. This study is undertaken only every ten years.

The purpose of Phase II of the study is to identify and describe those characteristics of restructuring middle level schools that are related most directly to student success. We are interested in studying intermediate, middle, and junior high schools and principals that are considered leaders in restructuring. We are not looking for the "best" or "top" schools, only those that are striving for significant student success through restructuring.

You and your school have been nominated for the study by state association leaders or national middle level experts. We would like to invite you and your school to participate in the study. Your superintendent has been contacted and approves of your participation.

You will be asked to administer NASSP's Comprehensive Assessment of School Environments (CASE) battery of instruments during the fall semester. (See Battery Summary). CASE profi'es 34 important school variables, including teacher, student and parent climate and satisfaction and six student outcomes. The CASE data will enable us to select ten schools of particular interest for site visitation. Your school will be visited by two members of our research team if it is selected for the followup study.

The school will incur no costs in administering the CASE-IMS battery. We will send you a school profile as one important perquisite of your participation in the study. All data and other information will be collected and reported in a confidential manner. Findings will be published in volume 2 of the study, entitled Leadership in Middle Level Education.

We hope that you will agree to participate in this landmark research. The information generated by our study will become an important part of the growing longitudinal database on middle level schools and their leaders. We will look forward to receiving your memorandum of agreement (enclosed) no later than September 1.

Very sincerely,

James W. Keefe, Ed.D.
Director of Research

JWK:bh
enclosures

Appendix A-3
School Response Form

Memorandum of Agreement

Attn: Dr. James W. Keefe

_____ I would like to participate in the Middle Level Principalship Study.

_____ I am not able to participate in the Middle Level Principalship Study.

_____
Signature

_____
Name (Please Type)

_____
Position

_____
School

_____
School Address

_____

_____

( )
_____
Phone Number (area code)

PLEASE RETURN TO NASSP BY SEPTEMBER 1, 1992 IN THE ENCLOSED STAMPED PRE-ADDRESSED ENVELOPE.

Appendix B-1
Principal Survey

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SECONDARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

A NATIONAL STUDY OF LEADERSHIP IN MIDDLE LEVEL EDUCATION

Principal Survey -- Phase II

Directions

Your questionnaire is identified by the label placed on it. It is not necessary to sign or place your name on the questionnaire. In reporting results, only statistical summaries of the responses of principals will be cited. In no case will the identity of an individual be divulged. You are urged to make every answer a sincere one.

Circle the number of the appropriate response using pen or pencil. If you change a response, please make the change obvious so there is no doubt about how you wish to answer.

Please attempt to answer every question. For some questions none of the alternatives may correspond exactly to your situation, or to the opinion you hold. In such cases mark the alternative which comes closest to the answer you would like to give.

For the purposes of this study, two terms should be clarified:

(1)**Middle level education** is a general phase used to encompass various combinations of grades five through nine.
(2)**Principal** refers to the chief building administrator and should not be confused with the assistant principal or vice principal.

Return your completed questionnaire to NASSP in the envelope provided. Thank you for your participation in this important study.

PLEASE RETURN THIS QUESTIONNAIRE WITHIN 10 DAYS

Advisory Committee for the National Study of Leadership in Middle Level Education:
James Anding, Nathan Hale Junior High School, Omaha, NE; James Aseltine, Irving Robbins Middle School, Farmington, CT; Don Dalton, Canyon Vista Middle School, Austin, TX; Marion Payne, Owen Brown Middle School, Columbia, MD; Lori Simmons, Commodore Bainbridge Middle School, Bainbridge Island, WA; Joseph Tafoya, Santa Ana Unified School District, Santa Ana, CA; Sue Carol Thompson, Blue Valley School District, Overland Park, KS.

Research Team:
Donald Clark, University of Arizona; Judith Irvin, Florida State University; James Keefe, NASSP; George Melton, NASSP Emeritus; Jerry Valentine, University of Missouri

DEMOGRAPHIC AND CONTROL QUESTIONS

1. What is your sex?

(1) Male	(2) Female

2. What is your age?

(1) 23 or under	(2) 24-29
(3) 30-34	(4) 35-39
(5) 40-44	(6) 45-49
(7) 50-54	(8) 55-59
(9) 60 or older	

3. With what ethnic group would you identify yourself?

(1) White	(2) Black
(3) Chicano/Hispanic	(4) American Indian
(5) Asian	(6) Other:_____

4. At what age were you appointed to your first principalship?

(1) 23 or under	
(2) 24-29	
(3) 30-34	(4) 35-39
(5) 40-44	(6) 45-49
(7) 50-54	(8) 55-59
(9) 60 or older	

5. How many years have you been principal of this school, including this current year?

(1) One	(2) Two
(3) Three	(4) 4-5
(5) 6-8	(6) 9-11
(7) 12-14	(8) 15-17
(9) 18 or more	

6. How many total years have you served as a principal of this and other schools, including this current year?.

(1) One	(2) 2-3
(3) 4-5	(4) 6-7
(5) 8-9	(6) 10-14
(7) 15-19	(8) 20-24
(9) 25 or more	

7. How many years of teaching experience, regardless of level, did you have prior to taking your present position? Do not include years as a full-time administrator or supervisor.

(1) None	(2) One
(3) 2-3	(4) 4-6
(5) 7-9	(6) 10-14
(7) 15-19	(8) 20-24
(9) 25 or more	

8. What is the highest degree you have earned?

(1) Less than bachelor's
(2) Bachelor's degree
(3) Master's degree in education
(4) Master's degree not in education
(5) Master's degree plus some additional graduate work
(6) Educational Specialist, six-year program or equivalent
(7) Master's degree plus all course work for a doctorate
(8) Doctor of Education
(9) Doctor of Philosophy
(10) Other:_____

9. Which of the following best represents your administrative certification for the principalship? *Choose only one answer.*

(1) Secondary (2) Middle
(3) Elementary (4) No principalship certification
(5) Other:_____

10. What is your career plan for the next 3-5 years? *Select one.*

(1) Remain in present position
(2) Retirement
(3) Seek a position as superintendent
(4) Seek a central office position other than superintendent
(5) Seek a different position as a middle level principal
(6) Seek a position as an elementary principal
(7) Seek a position as a high school principal
(8) Seek a position in a junior college or university
(9) Seek a position in a state department of education or other educational service agency (other than a school district)
(10) Return to full time teaching
(11) Seek a position in a career field other than education
(12) I am undecided

11. Which of the following categories best describes the middle level school of which you are principal. Select only one.

(1) Public (2) Parochial or diocesan
(3) Private, religious affiliated (4) Private, not religious affiliated
(5) Other:_____

12. How many students are currently enrolled in your school?

(1) Less than 200 (2) 200 - 399
(3) 400 - 599 (4) 600 - 799
(5) 800 - 999 (6) 1000 - 1199
(7) 1200 - 1399 (8) 1400 - 1599
(9) 1600 - 1799 (10) 1800 - 1999
(11) 2000 or more

13. What grades are included in the middle level school of which you are principal?

(1) 7-8-9 (2) 6-7-8
(3) 5-6-7 (4) 5-6-7-8
(5) 6-7-8-9 (6) 5-6
(7) 6-7 (8) 7-8
(9) 8-9 (10) Other:_____

14. Which of the following population categories best describes the locality of the middle level school of which you are principal?

(1) City, more than 1,000,000
(2) City, 150,000 to 999,999
(3) Suburban, related to city of 150,000 population or more
(4) City, 25,000 to 149,999 population, distinct from a metropolitan area
(5) City, 5,000 to 24,999, not suburban
(6) Town or rural under 4,999

15. In which geographical region is your school located?

(1) New England
(2) Mid-Atlantic
(3) South
(4) Midwest
(5) Southwest
(6) Rocky Mountain
(7) West Coast
(8) Alaska or Hawaii

SCHOOL LEADERSHIP QUESTIONS

16. How much authority do you have to fill teacher vacancies? Select one.

(1) I make the selection and the central office endorses it.
(2) I make the selection within limited options stipulated by the central office.
(3) I recommend a person to fill the vacancy and the central office makes the decision.
(4) The central office selects the teacher to fill the vacancy.

17. How much authority do you have to make alternative personnel decisions such as employing two or three teacher aides instead of one teacher?

(1) Unrestricted authority
(2) Authority with some restriction, such as approval by superiors
(3) No authority

18. To what extent do you participate in determining the budget allocation for your school?

(1) High participation
(2) Moderate participation
(3) Little participation
(4) No participation

19. To what extent do you have the authority to approve the allocation of discretionary funds within your school budget; i.e., how much autonomy or latitude do you have in the allocation of monies which are available to your building?

(1) Unrestricted authority
(2) Authority with some restriction, such as approval by superiors
(3) No authority

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The next question is about "leadership teams." Please respond according to the following definition of a "leadership team." A **Leadership team** is a group of teachers and administrators designated by the principal or elected by the faculty to assist in the leadership operation of the school. These staff members may have been formally designated, or they may be a more informal group obviously instrumental in the on-going operation of the school. If you do not have a leadership team, mark the following box and go to question 21.

❒ No leadership team

20. How many people on your staff comprise your "leadership team?"

(1) One
(2) Two
(3) Three
(4) Four
(5) Five
(6) Six
(7) Seven
(8) More than seven

21. Various individuals or groups are important to the decision-making process at the building level. Consider the types of decisions in the left-hand column and then indicate the degree of involvement of each person(s) in the appropriate box. Mark a "1" in the cell to indicate those who discuss the decision; Mark a "2" for those who make recommendations; Mark a "3" for those who make the actual decision; Mark a "0" if there is no involvement.

Thus: *0= No involvement* *2= Make recommendations*
1= Involved in discussion *3= Make decision*

	Principal	Assistant Principal	Leadership Team	Team Leaders/ Department Chairs	Staff Committees	Faculty as Whole	Individual Teachers	Students	Parents/Community	Central Office	School Board
(1) Adding new course or instructional program											
(2) Adopting rules for student behavior											
(3) Curricular reform											
(4) Developing a budget for your school											
(5) Evaluating teaching staff											
(6) Evaluating the school's grading practices											
(7) Formulating school goals & mission											
(8) Hiring teaching staff											
(9) School organization (teams vs. depts.)											

22. Much is written about involving parents and other citizens in education. Please identify the area(s) in which you involve parents or other citizens in a planning or advisory capacity in your school. Circle all appropriate responses.

(1) Objectives and priorities for the school
(2) Program changes and new programs being considered
(3) Student activities
(4) Student behavior, rights, responsibilities
(5) Finance and fund raising
(6) Evaluation of programs
(7) Parents or other citizens are not involved in any of the above

23. Please circle all the areas in which you involve parents or other citizens in the operation of your school.

(1) Advisors, counselors to individual students
(2) Monitors, supervisors, ticket sellers, etc., for student activities
(3) Operators of concessions, etc., for the benefit of the school
(4) Resource persons to programs and activities, including instruction
(5) Sponsors/moderators of student groups
(6) Volunteer aides
(7) Volunteer tutors
(8) Other: _____

24. What is the professional certification of the majority of your teachers?

(1) Secondary (2) Middle level (3) Elementary

25. What percent of your full-time teachers are women?

(1) Less than 10% (2) 20-29% (3) 20-29%
(4) 30-39% (5) 40-49% (6) 50-59%
(7) 60-69% (8) 70-79% (9) 80-89%
(10) 90-100%

26. Please rate your degree of job satisfaction with your job environment as principal.
Satisfaction with:

	Dissatisfied	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Unsure
(1) The realization of expectations you had when you took the job.	1	2	3	0
(2) The amount of time you devote to the job	1	2	3	0
(3) The results that you achieve.	1	2	3	0
(4) The salary you receive	1	2	3	0
(5) The working conditions	1	2	3	0
(6) The amount of assistance you received from your immediate supervisor.	1	2	3	0
(7) The rapport you have with your supervisor.	1	2	3	0
(8) The rapport you have with your administrative colleagues.	1	2	3	0
(9) The rapport you have with teachers.	1	2	3	0
(10) The rapport you have with students.	1	2	3	0
(11) The rapport you have with parents and members of the community.	1	2	3	0

EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM QUESTIONS

27. While a variety of terms may be used to describe a school's academic schedule (e.g., block, flexible, modular), most schools have a specific number of periods per day. How many instructional periods does your school schedule have? Select only one answer.

(1) Five (2) Six (3) Seven
(4) Eight (5) Other:_____

28. What is the length of your school's basic instructional period?

(1) 40 minutes (2) 41-45 minutes (3) 46-50 minutes
(4) 51-55 minutes (5) 56-60 minutes (6) 61 minutes or more

29. In your school, what is the classroom teacher to pupil ratio for the current school year? Select the one alternative that comes closest to your ratio.

(1) 1 teacher for 10 or fewer students (5) 1 teacher for 26 to 30 students
(2) 1 teacher for 11 to 15 students (6) 1 teacher for 31 to 35 students
(3) 1 teacher for 16 to 20 students (7) 1 teacher for 36 to 40 students
(4) 1 teacher for 21 to 25 students (8) 1 teacher for 41 or more students

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

30. Using the key listed below, please circle the numbers which best describe the grade reporting procedures used in your school to report pupil progress to parents for the basic subject areas of Language Arts, Math, Science and Social Studies. *Circle all numbers that apply for each grade level.*

(1) Letter Scale
(2) Word Scale (e.g., Excellent, Good)
(3) Number Scale (e.g., 1-5)
(4) Satisfactory-Unsatisfactory; Pass-Fail
(5) Informal written notes
(6) Percentage marks (e.g., 86%)
(7) Progress in relation to potential
(8) Other:_____

Grade Reporting System

(1) Grade 5	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
(2) Grade 6	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
(3) Grade 7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
(4) Grade 8	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
(5) Grade 9	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8

31. Ability grouping is the assignment of students to classes based upon academic ability. Which statement best describes ability grouping in your school (excluding special education classes)?

(1) We have no form of grouping by academic ability
(2) We group students into specific classes by academic ability; e.g., grouping for reading or math classes
(3) We do not group students into specific classes by academic ability, but teachers do group their students by academic ability within specific classes.

32. Which of the following best describes the future of ability grouping in your school (exclusive of special education classes)? Select only one answer.

(1) We have ability grouping and have no plans to change our current process
(2) We have ability grouping but are considering eliminating it
(3) We have studied the issue and will eliminate ability grouping within the next year
(4) We do not currently group by ability and plan to continue that way
(5) We do not currently group by ability but are considering changing to ability grouping
(6) We do not currently group by ability but we have studied the issue and will begin ability grouping within the next year.

33. Four organizational formats are commonly employed for instruction in middle level education. For the five subject areas listed below, please identify the type of organizational format used to teach the majority of students at each grade level in your school. Mark only the grades in your school. The four organizational formats are:

(1) **Self-contained classroom** (one teacher teaches more than one subject to the same group of students)
(2) **Interdisciplinary teaming** (two or more teachers work together as a team to teach more than one subject to the same group of students)
(3) Period by period **departmentalized instruction** (a teacher teaches a subject to a different group of students period by period and that teacher is not part of a team for that subject)
(4) **Disciplinary Teaming** (two or more teachers work together as a team to teach the same subject to a group of students)

Circle the "0" if the subject is not taught at that grade.

The example below is for a school with grades 5-6-7-8. Mathematics is taught to most students using a self-contained classroom format in grade 5, an interdisciplinary teaming format in grade 6, a departmentalized period by period and subject by subject format in grade 7 and a disciplinary teaming format in grade 8.

	GRADE-5	GRADE-6	GRADE-7	GRADE-8	GRADE-9
SUBJECT AREA:					
EXAMPLE:					
Mathematics	0 (1) 2 3 4	0 1 (2) 3 4	0 1 2 (3) 4	0 1 2 3 (4)	0 1 2 3 4
(1) English /Language Arts	0 1 2 3 4	0 1 2 3 4	0 1 2 3 4	0 1 2 3 4	0 1 2 3 4
(2) Mathematics	0 1 2 3 4	0 1 2 3 4	0 1 2 3 4	0 1 2 3 4	0 1 2 3 4
(3)Science	0 1 2 3 4	0 1 2 3 4	0 1 2 3 4	0 1 2 3 4	0 1 2 3 4
(4)Social Science	0 1 2 3 4	0 1 2 3 4	0 1 2 3 4	0 1 2 3 4	0 1 2 3 4
(5)Reading	0 1 2 3 4	0 1 2 3 4	0 1 2 3 4	0 1 2 3 4	0 1 2 3 4

If your school has one or more interdisciplinary teams of teachers working with an expanded group of students, please respond to the following nine questions. If you do not have one or more interdisciplinary teams, mark this box and go to item 43.

☐ No interdisciplinary teams

34. We have interdisciplinary teams for grade(s):

(1) 5 (2) 6 (3) 7 (4) 8 (5) 9

35. Our teams include the following subject areas:

(1) Math, Science, Social Sciences, English/Language Arts
(2) Math, Science, Social Sciences, English/Language Arts, Reading
(3) Other: _____

36. Our team teachers have: (Circle all that apply.)

(1) One planning period that is not necessarily at the same time for all members of the team
(2) One planning period at the same time for all members of the team
(3) One common planning period for all team members plus an individual planning period.

37. The students who are a part of a team:

(1) Are taught only by the teachers of their team for a "teaming" subject
(2) May be taught by a non-team teacher for a "teaming" subject (exclusive of special education)

38. Students are assigned to their respective team:

(1) Heterogeneously (e.g., at random)
(2) Homogeneously (e.g., by ability, by achievement, by interest)

39. Team leaders: (Circle all that apply.)

(1) Are appointed by the administration
(2) Are selected by the team members
(3) Are rotated among the members of the team
(4) Are given released time for team leader responsibilities (additional time compared to other team members)
(5) Are given monetary compensation for their team leader responsibilities
(6) We do not have a designated team leader.

40. Which of the following best describes the location of classrooms used by teachers who teach on the same team?

(1) The classrooms of all teachers on the same team are adjacent
(2) The classrooms of most teachers on the same team are adjacent
(3) The classrooms of teachers on the same team are not adjacent

41. When the teams of teachers were organized, what process was used to determine team membership?

(1) The administration appointed the teams
(2) The administration appointed the teams after input from the teachers
(3) The teachers selected their own teams
(4) Other:_____

42. What approximate percent of your students (excluding special education students) are receiving some of their instruction from an interdisciplinary teaching team?

(1) 25% or Less (2) 26-50% (3) 51-75% (4) 76-100%

ISSUES AND TRENDS QUESTIONS

43. What do you think is the ideal grade organizational structure for a middle level school?

(1) 7-8-9 (4) 5-6-7-8 (7) 6-7 (10) Other:_____
(2) 6-7-8 (5) 6-7-8-9 (8) 7-8
(3) 5-6-7 (6) 5-6 (9) 8-9

44. If your school has adopted a "middle school" organizational plan which includes either grades 5-6-7-8 or 6-7-8, please circle all the reasons for adopting either of these two patterns. If your system has not changed to a middle school plan of grades 5-6-7-8 or 6-7-8, please circle item (10).

(1) Provide a better transition from elementary to high school
(2) Solve concerns about a junior high program
(3) Employ new curriculum or instructional innovations
(4) Utilize a new school facility or building
(5) Adjust to enrollment trends
(6) Employ ideas or programs successfully implemented in other schools
(7) Provide a program best suited to the needs of the middle level age student
(8) Move ninth graders into a high school program
(9) Provide fifth and/or sixth graders with more curricular specialization
(10) Does not apply.

45. All things considered (learning conditions, teaching staff, capital outlay, etc.), what is your judgment about the optimum number of students for a middle level school?

(1) Less than 200
(2) 200-399
(3) 400-599
(4) 600-799
(5) 800-999
(6) 1000-1199
(7) 1200-1399
(8) 1400-1599
(9) 1600-1799
(10) 2800-1999
(11) 2000 or more

46. Ability grouping is the assignment of students to classes based upon academic ability. Which statement best describes your opinion about academic ability grouping of students (excluding special education classes).

(1) There should be no form of ability grouping
(2) Ability grouping of students into certain classes is appropriate
(3) Ability grouping of students into any class is not appropriate, but grouping of students for instruction within a class is appropriate.

47. Identify any grade levels at which you feel greater emphasis should be placed upon intramural rather than interscholastic activities.

(1) All middle level grades
(2) Grades 8 and below
(3) Grades 7 and below
(4) Grades 6 and below
(5) Grade 5

48. Does your school have some system of individualized promotion for students rather than the customary grade placement and year-end promotion.

(1) Yes (please describe briefly)
_____
(2) No, we do not have individualized promotion
(3) No, we do not have individualized promotion, but I would like us to move in that direction.

49. What forms of educational technology do you utilize in the instructional programs of your school? Circle all that apply.

(1) No educational technology is used in our school
(2) Educational television channels/programs only
(3) Distance education (remote access combining several technologies)
(4) Interactive video (remote access)
(5) Interactive video (within school)
(6) Computer-managed instruction
(7) Computer-assisted instruction
(8) Other:_____

50. Please indicate the degree to which <u>you believe</u> the middle level characteristics listed below are important to an instructionally effective middle level school. Then, indicate the degree to which <u>your school currently implements</u> these middle level characteristics. Finally, please identify the <u>plans you have</u> in your school to implement each characteristic.

CATEGORY DESCRIPTIONS:

Importance of Characteristic. Use the following scale to describe the degree of importance of each characteristic to an instructionally effective middle level school.
(1) Little or no importance--absence of this characteristic will not affect the operation of the school.
(2) Somewhat important--presence of this characteristic adds to the quality of the school.
(3) Very important--presence of this characteristic is critical to a quality school.

Current Implementation: Use the following scale to describe the degree of implementation of each characteristic.
(1) No implementation--we do not have this characteristic in our school.
(2) Partial implementation--we implement this characteristic but not every aspect as it is described in the statement.
(3) Full implementation--we implement every aspect of the characteristic as described in the statement.

Plans for Implementation. Use the following scale to describe the plans you have in your school for implementing the characteristic.
(1) We implement the characteristic fully and plan to continue to do so.
(2) We implement the characteristic fully but plan to discontinue doing so in the next two years.
(3) We do not implement the characteristic fully but already have plans to do so in the next two years.
(4) We do not implement the characteristic fully but are considering full implementation in the next two years.
(5) We do not implement the characteristic fully and plan to continue as we are for the next two years.

Characteristic:	Importance of Characteristic	Current Implementation	Plans for Implementation
(1) Interdisciplinary teams of 2-5 teachers sharing common students, common planning time and housed in close proximity.	1 2 3	1 2 3	1 2 3 4 5
(2) Exploratory course offerings which provide required (not elective) curricular opportunities for all students (e.g. computers, family living, industrial technology, music).	1 2 3	1 2 3	1 2 3 4 5

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

(3) Advisor-advisee program regularly scheduled for 15 minutes or more during each classroom day.	1 2 3	1 2 3	1 2 3 4 5
(4) Cocurricular program separate from regular graded courses, but occurring during the school day, designed to provide students with the opportunity to pursue leadership roles, special interests and socialization.	1 2 3	1 2 3	1 2 3 4 5
(5) Intramural activities offered for all students during or immediately after the regular classroom day.	1 2 3	1 2 3	1 2 3 4 5

51. Circle the types of professional development activity in which you have been involved during the past two years.

(1) National professional organization institute or conference (voluntary participation)
(2) State professional organization activity (voluntary participation)
(3) Activity conducted by private consultants at an out-of-district location (voluntary participation)
(4) District activity required as part of employment
(5) Other district activities (voluntary participation)
(6) Enrollment in graduate courses at a college or university
(7) State department or regional educational agency activity (voluntary participation)
(8) State department or regional educational agency activity (required participation)
(9) Principal center or Academy (voluntary participation)
(10) Other: specify_____

52. In recent years, the issue of teacher preparation has been a topic of much interest. Which of the following best describe the method(s) by which your teachers have been prepared to teach, specifically, at the middle level? Circle more than one if appropriate.

(1) Inservice programs
(2) Student/practice teaching at middle level
(3) Courses at the university which focus on middle level education
(4) Personal study
(5) Other:_____
(6) Generally, the staff has not had special preparation to teach at the middle level

53. Please identify the three most important skills/characteristics of an "excellent" middle level teacher. *Circle only three.*

(1) Competence in subject matter knowledge
(2) Competence in use of varied and developmentally appropriate methods of instruction
(3) Competence in adjusting instruction to the varying learning styles and learning skills of the students
(4) Competence in developing a positive relationship with students in the classroom.
(5) Competence in counseling students
(6) Competence in working as a team member
(7) Competence in using positive methods for student discipline
(8) Competence in promoting positive student self-concept
(9) Competence in employee behaviors and work habits (dependability, punctuality, attendance)
(10) Competence in working with parents
(11) Competence in working with colleagues

54. Much has been written about the tasks of American schools. Please rank the 11 statements below according to your belief about their relative importance as educational purposes.
Assign a rank of "1" to the statement you consider most important, a rank of "2" to the next most important, until you assign a rank of "11" to the statement you consider least important.

(1) Acquisition of basic skills (reading, writing, speaking, computing, etc.)
(2) Appreciation for and experience with the fine arts
(3) Career Planning and training in beginning occupational skills
(4) Development of moral and spiritual values
(5) Development of positive self-concept and good human relations
(6) Development of skills and practice in critical intellectual inquiry and problem solving
(7) Development of the skills to function in a technological society (engineering, scientific, etc.)
(8) Knowledge about and skills in preparation for family life (sex education, home management, problems of aging, etc.)
(9) Preparation for a changing world
(10) Physical fitness and useful leisure time sports
(11) Understanding of the American value system (its political, economic, social values, etc.)

THANK YOU FOR TAKING THE TIME TO COMPLETE THIS SURVEY!
PLEASE RETURN THE SURVEY IN THE ENVELOPE PROVIDED.

Appendix B-2

Variables of the NASSP COMPREHENSIVE ASSESSMENT OF SCHOOL ENVIRONMENTS (CASE) MODEL

The variables listed are those identified by NASSP's Task Force on Effective School Climate (November, 1988) based on findings reported in the national validation study of the CASE Model (Schmitt & Doherty, 1988).

School District and Community Environment

POP	Population of the area in which the school is located.
SCHATT	Percentage of school age children in the area served by the school.

Input Variables

GOV	Whether the school is public or private, church-related or not.
MINORITY *	Percentage of minorities enrolled in the school.
LUNCH *	Number of students receiving free or reduced-price lunches.
REMED *	Percentage of students in remedial programs.
BUDGRES	Number of activities for which budgeted resources are available.
ELECT	Number of elective courses in the curriculum.
STUDEXP	Average per pupil expenditure (exclusive of capital outlay).
CHGSCL	Principal's attitude toward change.
ADMINPERF	Performance of the school's administrative team.
TEACHSAL	Average teacher salary.
STRATIO *	Student-teacher ratio.
PROFRAT	Percentage of school employees who are professionals.
TRANSFER *	Number of transfers in and out of the school.
ATTEND	Percentage of students in average daily attendance.
SENG	Number of students whose primary language is English.
PHIERSCL *	Principal perceptions of autonomy of action in the district.
PPARTSCL	Principal perceptions of participation in school decisions.
NOSTUDS	Number of students enrolled in the school.
SDRESRUL	Nature of student dress rules in the school.
SEMPRUL	Nature of student employment rules in the school.
GOALS *	Importance of 14 selected school goals.
TSATSCL	Teacher satisfaction (NASSP Teacher Satisfaction Survey).
THIERSCL *	Teacher perceptions of autonomy of action in the district or school.
TPARTSCL	Teacher perception of participation in school decisions.

School Climate

TCLIMSCL	Teacher Climate (NASSP School Climate Survey)
SCLIMSCL	Student Climate (NASSP School Climate Survey)

Outcomes

TOTACH	Total achievement (combined reading and mathematics scores).
DISPSCL *	Percentage of students receiving disciplinary referrals.
PASAC	Percentage of students passing all courses.
SSATSCL	Student satisfaction (NASSP Student Satisfaction Survey).
SEFFSCL *	Student self-efficacy (Brookover Self-Concept of Ability scale).
STUDCOMP	Percentage of students completing the school year (not dropping out).

* Reverse scored; lower score better.

Definitions

Satisfaction. In the NASSP Model of Effective School Environments, satisfaction is defined as "the individual's affective response to his or her particular environment."

Climate. In the NASSP Model of Effective School Environments, climate is defined as "the relatively enduring pattern of shared perceptions about the characteristics of an organization and its members."

The NASSP Teacher Satisfaction Survey. The NASSP Teacher (Job) Satisfaction Survey is one of a battery of instruments developed by the NASSP Task Force on Effective School Environments as part of a battery of assessment instruments and procedures for the Comprehensive Assessment of School Environments. This instrument includes nine (9) distinct scales; the names and definitions for these scales are listed below:

- Administration. This scale includes items about teacher satisfaction with administrator behaviors related to concern, support, feedback, supervision, and praise for teacher's efforts.

- Compensation. Teacher perceptions of, and satisfaction with, salary, fringe benefits, financial security, and adequacy of compensation.

- Advancement Opportunities. Teacher satisfaction with opportunities for career advancement through promotion or staff development for new career roles.

- Student and Discipline. Teacher satisfaction with student conduct and disciplinary practices followed in the school.

- Curriculum and Job Duties. Teacher satisfaction with the quality of curricular offerings and the workload of teachers in developing curriculum and providing instruction.

- Co-Workers. Teacher satisfaction with the personal and professional characteristics and behaviors of colleagues.

- Parents and Community. Teacher satisfaction with the levels of involvement and support, both personal and financial, provided by parents and community members.

- Building and Supplies. Teacher satisfaction with the quantity, quality, and availability of supplies and with the adequacy and maintenance of the building and grounds.

- Communication. Teacher satisfaction with the ease, accuracy, and availability of information and communication about important school and district events.

The NASSP Student Satisfaction Survey. The NASSP Student Satisfaction Survey is another of a battery of instruments developed by the NASSP Task Force on Effective School Environments. This instrument includes eight (8) distinct scales; the names and definitions for these scales are listed below:

- Teachers. Student satisfaction with personal characteristics and behaviors of teachers, including teacher helpfulness, teacher interest in teaching and in students as individuals.

- Fellow Students. Student satisfaction with peer group relationships and the school spirit among peers.

- Curriculum. Student satisfaction with the quality of curricula, the availability of student choices, and the quality of instruction provided.

- Student Activities. Student satisfaction with the number and types of school-sponsored activities and with opportunities for student participation.

- Student Discipline. Student satisfaction with the degree to which the school is an orderly and safe environment.

- Decision Making. Student satisfaction with opportunities for active involvement in classroom activities and in opportunities to provide input and to be listened to in school decision making, (about curriculum, rules and procedures, etc.).

- Buildings and Supplies. Student satisfaction with the quality and maintenance of the school building and grounds and with the quality and availability of library resources, equipment, and supplies necessary for instructional activities.

- Communication. Student satisfaction with levels of information provided to students and with opportunities to communicate with others about important topics or events occurring in the school; student satisfaction with information to parents and others in the home environment.

The NASSP Parent Satisfaction Survey. The NASSP Parent Satisfaction Survey is the third in a battery of instruments developed by the NASSP Task Force on Effective School Environments. This instrument includes nine (9) distinct scales; the names and definitions for these scales are listed below:

- Parent Involvement. Parent satisfaction with the level of involvement and the willingness to become involved in activities of the school by parents and other community members; satisfaction with opportunities to become involved in school affairs.

- Curriculum. Parent satisfaction with the quality and range of curricular offerings available in the school; satisfaction with opportunities for parental input into curricular decision-making.

- Student Activities. Parent satisfaction with the quality, range, and degree of emphasis placed on student activities and social events within the school environment.

- Teachers. Parent satisfaction with the personal and professional characteristics of teachers and the degree to which teachers hold high expectations for student social and academic performance and the degree to which teachers serve as good role models for students.

- Support Services. Parent satisfaction with support services provided for students by the school; e.g., transportation, guidance and counseling, food services.

- Buildings and Supplies. Parent satisfaction with the adequacy and cleanliness of school grounds and facilities; satisfaction with the availability of equipment and supplies needed for instruction.

- Student Discipline. Parent levels of satisfaction with the degree to which disciplinary problems exist in the school (including vandalism, use of controlled substances, personal violence) and the way discipline is handled by the school.

- Administrators. Parent satisfaction with the competence, performance, leadership, and vision exhibited by school administrators; satisfaction with communication practices of school administrators.

- Information Services. Parent satisfaction with opportunities to communicate with school personnel, with the clarity of school forms and procedures used by parents, and with information provided about the school in news media.

The NASSP School Climate Survey. The NASSP School Climate Survey is another in the battery of instruments developed by the NASSP Task Force on Effective School Environments to be used with all three respondent groups: teachers, students, and parents. This instrument has ten (10) distinct scales; the names and definitions for these scales are listed below:

- Teacher-Student Relationships. Perceptions about the nature and quality of interpersonal relationships between teachers and students, with teacher patience and helpfulness to students, with teacher "fairness" in working with students and in issuing marks or grades, and with the quality of teacher explanations to students.

- Student-Student Relations. Perceptions about the extent to which students care about and respect each other, and the extent to which students work together in a cooperative and cordial manner.

- Student Values. Perceptions about student levels of self-discipline and understanding or tolerance of people who are different from themselves.

- Student Task Orientation. Perceptions about student attention to task and student understanding of responsibilities for performance and achievement.

- Student Activities. Perceptions about opportunities for students to participate in activity programs and about student interest in, and willingness to participate in, student activities.

- Guidance Services. Perceptions of the quality of course and career planning services and personal counseling services provided to students.

- Instructional Management. Perceptions of the quality of teacher planning and behavior in using time for instruction and providing appropriate explanations and tasks for students engaged in instructional activities.

- Buildings and Grounds. Perceptions of the extent to which the building and grounds are attractive and well-maintained and the degree of personal safety or security people feel when present for activities in the building.

- Administrative Leadership. Perceptions of the degree to which building administrators are effective in communicating with differing role groups, set reasonable but high expectations for school performance by faculty and students, and are good role models.

- Parent and Community Participation. Perceptions of the level, quality, and degree of participation and interaction between the school and parents or community members.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Appendix C-1

Site-Visit and Restructuring Sample

School	Study Pseudonym	Numeric ID
A	Metro Academy	08
B	Mountain View	30
C	Southland	39
D	Desert View	02
E	Maple Grove	10
F	Heartland	01
G	Lone Star	34
H	Pacific	20
I	--	14
J	--	17
K	--	22
L	--	32
M	--	26
N	--	04
O	--	23
P	--	21
Q	--	07
R	--	12
S	--	11
T	--	13
U	--	03
V	--	05
W	--	28
X	--	38
Y	--	06

APPENDIX C-2

Demographic Characteristics of Site-Visit Sample, Restructuring Sample and 1992 National Random Sample

STUDENT ENROLLMENT

	200	200-399	400-599	600-799	800-999	1000+
Site-visit Sample	13%	13%	25%	13%	13%	25%
Restructuring Sample	8%	4%	24%	28%	20%	16%
National Random Sample	3%	19%	27%	23%	12%	16%

GRADE ORGANIZATION PATTERN
Site-Visit Sample,

	5-6-7-8	6-7-8	7-8	7-8-9	Other
Site-visit Sample	- -	63%	25%	13%	--
Restructuring Sample	- -	60%	20%	12%	8%
National Random Sample	12%	50%	18%	15%	5%

COMMUNITY POPULATION

	150,000+	Suburban	25,000-149,999	5,000-24,999	4,999 or Rural
Site-visit Sample	25%	38%	13%	13%	13%
Restructuring Sample	28%	32%	12%	20%	8%
National Random Sample	13%	25%	16%	21%	26%

GEOGRAPHIC REGIONS

	New England	Mid Atlantic	South	Midwest	Southwest	Rocky Mountain	West Coast
Site-visit Sample	13	13	13	13	25	13	13
Restructuring Sample	12	4	16	48	12	4	4
National Random Sample	10	17	17	31	9	5	11

NOTES: Percentages are rounded, some may not equal 100%

Site-visit Sample n=8, Restructuring Sample n=25, 1992 National Random Sample n=570

APPENDIX C-3

PRINCIPAL SURVEY DATA FOR RESTRUCTURING SAMPLE
(All numbers expressed in percentages)
(n=25)

DEMOGRAPHIC

1. **Principal Gender**

Male	Female
68	32

2. **Age**

Under 35	35-39	40-45	45-49	50-54	55+
0	16	32	20	24	8

3. **Ethnic Group**

White	Black	Chicano/Hispanic	American Indian	Asian
96	4	0	0	0

4. **Age of first principalship**

23 or under	24-29	30-34	35-39	40-44	45-49	50+
4	32	16	24	20	4	0

5. **Years as principal in current school**

1	2	3	4-5	6-8	9-11	12-14	15-17	18 or more
0	16	8	4	24	20	20	4	4

6. **Total years as principal**

1	2-3	4-5	6-7	8-9	10-14	15-19	20-24	25 or more
0	12	0	8	20	32	20	0	8

7. **Years of teaching experience prior to present position**

None	One	2-3	4-6	7-9	10-14	15-19	20 or more
0	0	20	28	12	36	4	0

8. **Highest degree earned**

MA-ED	MA-Not ED	MA+	Educ. Spec	ABD	EdD	PhD
8	4	40	12	12	16	8

9. **Administrative certification for the principalship**

Secondary	Middle	Elementary	None	Other
40	8	16	4	32

10. **Career plan for the next 3-5 years**

Remain in present position	68
Retirement	4
Superintendent	0
Central office other than superintendent	12
Different middle level principalship	12
Elementary principal	0
High school principal	4
Junior college or university position	0
State department of education	0
Full time teaching	0
Career not in education	0
Undecided	4

11. **Describe the category of your middle level school**

Public	96
Parochial or diocesan	0
Private/Religious	0
Private not Religious	4
Other	0

SCHOOL/COMMUNITY

12. **Student Enrollment**

Less than 200	8	200-399	4	400-599	24
600-799	28	800-999	20	1000-1199	8
1200-1399	4	1400-1599	0		
1600-1799	4	1800+	0		

13. **Grades Included in School**

7-8-9	6-7-8	5-6-7-8	7-8	Other
12	60	0	20	8

14. **Community Population**

City-1,000,000+	4	City - 150,000-999,999	24
Suburb	32	City - 25,000-149,999	12
City- 5,000-24,999	20	Town or rural less than 4,999	8

15. **Geographic Region**

New Eng.	Mid-Atl.	South	Midwest	Southwest	Rky Mtn.	West
12	4	16	48	12	4	4

SCHOOL LEADERSHIP

16. **Authority to fill teacher vacancies**

Select	76	Select/limited	16	Recommend	4	Central Office	4

17. **Authority in alternative personnel decisions**

Unrestricted	0	Some restriction	76	None	24

18. **Participation in budget allocation**

High	24	Moderate	28	Little	20	None	28

19. **Authority to approve allocation of discretionary funds**

Unrestricted	36	Some restriction	60	None	4

20. **Leadership Team present in school**

YES	NO
84	16

20A. **Number of staff members on the Leadership Team**

Three:	5	Four:	5	Six:	[illegible]	Seven:	5	Eight+:	80

21. Involvement of various individuals in decision making

	PR		AP		LT		TD		SC		FW		IT		ST		PC		CO		SB	
Adding new course	0	8	0	52	9	35	4	38	13	30	8	52	0	68	44	36	4	75	4	25	16	12
or instructional program	52	40	44	4	39	17	54	4	57	0	36	4	32	0	20	0	21	0	33	38	0	72
Adopting rules for	0	12	0	13	18	4	4	17	17	13	0	28	4	52	4	60	12	64	41	17	44	4
student behavior	12	76	26	61	39	39	62	17	61	9	36	36	28	16	28	8	20	4	17	25	8	44
	0	8	4	35	17	17	8	21	9	13	8	44	8	54	42	42	8	63	4	18	8	13
Curricular reform	44	48	52	9	48	18	50	21	61	17	36	12	29	9	16	0	25	4	39	39	4	75
Developing a budget	4	0	13	23	18	18	17	29	27	23	33	33	8	42	74	13	54	33	17	9	25	13
for your school	46	50	64	0	59	5	46	8	50	0	30	4	50	0	13	0	13	0	30	44	4	58
	0	4	9	9	59	27	46	36	55	27	71	25	46	33	79	21	83	17	43	22	71	13
Evaluating teaching staff	4	92	5	77	9	5	12	4	14	4	4	0	21	0	0	0	0	0	26	9	8	8
Evaluating the school's	4	8	4	23	9	4	8	21	9	18	4	29	4	46	46	42	13	50	22	18	33	8
grading practices	21	67	50	23	55	32	58	13	59	14	50	17	50	0	12	0	37	0	30	30	13	46
Formulating school	0	4	4	23	14	9	12	25	9	18	0	33	12	38	33	42	4	50	18	30	42	8
goals and mission	42	54	32	41	23	54	42	21	50	23	17	50	42	8	21	4	33	13	39	13	25	25
	4	0	9	23	41	18	17	17	41	13	67	21	38	33	88	8	75	8	13	13	25	4
Hiring teaching staff	25	71	36	32	27	14	41	25	32	14	12	0	29	0	4	0	17	0	30	44	8	63
School organization	0	0	4	9	9	14	8	17	9	18	4	29	8	38	67	21	33	37	22	18	29	21
(team vs. dept.)	21	79	55	32	50	27	50	25	59	14	50	17	46	8	12	0	25	4	30	30	21	29

(PR=Principal AP=Assistant Principal; LT=Leadership Team; TD=Team Leaders or Department Chairs; SC=Staff Committee; FW=Faculty as Whole; IT=Individual Teacher; ST=Students; PC=Parents or Community; CO=Central Office; SB=School Board)

LEGEND

No Involvement	Involved in Discussions
Make Recommendations	Make Decisions

22. **Parents involved in planning or advisory capacity**

Objectives and priorities for the school	96
Program changes and new programs being considered	84
Student activities	88
Student behavior, rights, responsibilities	64
Finance and fund raising	88
Evaluation of programs	64
Parents or other citizens not involved in above	4

23. **Parents involved in operation**

Advisers, counselors to individual students	32
Monitors, supervisors, ticket sellers, etc	88
Operators of concessions, etc. for school benefit	68
Resource persons to programs and activities	100
Sponsors/moderators of student groups	60
Volunteer aides	84
Other	8

24. **Professional certification of majority of teachers**

Secondary	74	Middle Level	17	Elementary	9

25. **Percent of female full-time teachers**

Less than 20	0	20-29	4	30-39	4
40-49	0	50-59	24	60-69	28
70-79	32	80-89	8	90-100	0

26. **Degree of job satisfaction**

	Dissatisfied	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Unsure
(1) The realization of expectations you had when you took the job	8	67	25	0
(2) The amount of time you devote to the job	20	36	40	4
(3) The results that you achieve	0	64	36	0
(4) The salary you receive	20	28	52	0
(5) The working conditions	12	56	32	0
(6) The amount of assistance you received from your immediate supervisor	8	52	36	4
(7) The rapport you have with your supervisor	0	72	28	0
(8) The rapport you have with your administrative colleagues	0	76	20	4
(9) The rapport you have with teachers	0	80	20	0
(10) The rapport you have with students.	4	84	12	0
(11) The rapport you have with parents and members of the community.	0	72	28	0

EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

27. **Number of instructional periods in schedule**

Five	Six	Seven	Eight	Other
0	8	52	36	4

28. **Length of school's basic instructional period**

40 minutes	12	41-45 minutes	36	46-50 minutes	48
51-55 minutes	0	56-60 minutes	4	61 minutes or more	0

29. **Classroom teacher to pupil ratio for current school year**

1 teacher for 10 or fewer students	0	1 teacher for 26 to 30	38
1 teacher for 11 to 15 students	8	1 teacher for 31 to 35	8
1 teacher for 16 to 20 students	13	1 teacher for 36 to 40	0
1 teacher for 21 to 25 students	33	1 teacher for 41 or more	0

30. **Grade reporting procedures for the basic subject areas**

Legend:

(1) Letter Scale
(2) Word Scale (e.g., Excellent, Good)
(3) Number Scale (e.g., 1-5)
(4) Satisfactory-Unsatisfactory
(5) Informal written notes
(6) Percentage marks (e.g.,, 86%)
(7) Progress in relation to potential
(8) Other

N	Grade	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
2	5	0	50	50	50	50	50	0	50
17	6	66	24	18	24	42	54	12	30
25	7	76	28	16	32	56	36	29	24
25	8	76	28	16	32	56	36	16	24
4	9	100	0	0	25	75	0	25	0

31. **Grouping by academic ability**

No form of grouping	21
Group into specific classes	67
Group within classes	12

32. **Which best describes the future of ability grouping?**

Have ability grouping and no plans to change	24
Have ability grouping but considering elimination	44
Have studied the issue -- will eliminate within next year	8
Do not currently group by ability and plan to continue	24
Do not currently group by ability but are considering	0
Do not currently group by ability -- will begin next year	0

33. **Four organizational formats used to teach the majority of students at each grade level in your school**
(0) Subject not taught at that grade
(1) Self-contained classroom
(2) Interdisciplinary teaming
(3) Period by period departmentalized instruction
(4) Disciplinary Teaming

	N = 2 Grade 5					N = 17 Grade 6					N = 25 Grade 7					N = 25 Grade 8					N = 4 Grade 9			
	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	3
1. English Lang. Arts	-	-	100	-	-	-	-	82	12	6	-	4	76	20	-	-	8	68	24	-	-	-	25	75
2. Mathematics	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	3
	-	-	100	-	-	-	-	82	12	6	-	4	76	20	-	-	4	60	32	4	-	-	25	75
3. Science	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	3
	-	-	100	-	-	-	-	82	18	-	-	76	20	4	-	-	4	60	32	4	-	-	25	75
4. Social Science	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	3
	-	-	100	-	-	-	-	82	18	-	-	7	76	16	4	-	4	64	28	4	-	-	25	75
5. Reading	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	3
	-	-	100	-	-	12	-	70	12	6	24	4	44	28	-	36	8	28	28	-	25	-	25	50

34. **Interdisciplinary teams**

YES	NO
88	12

34A. **Interdisciplinary teams by grade level**

5	6	7	8	9
100	100	96	86	25

35. **Subject area teams:**

Math, Science, Social Sciences, English/Language Arts	55
Math, Science, Social Sciences, English/Language Arts, Reading	41
Other	32

36. **Planning time for team members**

One period not at same time	0
One period at same time	18
One common period plus an individual period	82

37. **Students scheduled for a team**

Are taught team subjects by team members only	100
May be taught team subjects by non-team teachers	0

38. **Students are assigned to teams**

Heterogeneously	96
Homogeneously	4

39. **Team leaders are**

Appointed by Administration	50
Selected by team members	82
Rotated among team members	41
Given released time	18
Given monetary compensation	50
No team leaders	4

40. **Classrooms used by team teachers**

All classrooms adjacent	41
Most classrooms adjacent	50
Classrooms not adjacent	9

41. **Team membership determined**

Appointed by administration	14
Appointed by administration with teacher input	68
Teachers selected their own team	9
Other	9

42. **Percentage of students receiving some instruction from interdisciplinary teaching team**

25 or less	0	26-50	9	51-75	23	76-100	68

ISSUES AND TRENDS

43. **Ideal grade organizational structure for middle level schools**

7-8-9	0	6-7-8	80	5-6-7	0	5-6-7-8	8
5-6-7-8-9	0	5-6	0	6-7	0	7-8	8
8-9	0	Other	4				

44. **Reasons why your school (if applicable) has adopted a "middle school" organizational plan which includes either grades 5-6-7-8 or 6-7-8**

Provide better transition from elementary to high school	94
Solve concerns about a junior high program	56
Employ new curriculum or instructional innovations	67
Utilize a new school facility or building	11
Adjust to enrollment trends	56
Employ ideas or programs successfully implemented in other schools	61
Provide a program best suited to the needs of the middle level-age student	100
Move ninth graders into a high school program	33
Provide fifth and/or sixth graders with more curricular specialization	28
Does not apply	28

45. **Optimum number of students for a middle level school**

Less than 200	0	200-399	12	400-599	24	600-799	52
800-999	8	1000-1199	4	1200 or more	0		

46. **Opinions about academic ability grouping**

Should be no form of ability grouping	24
Certain classes appropriate	20
Grouping within a class appropriate	56

47. **Emphasis placed upon intramural rather than interscholastic activities**

All middle level grades	60	Grades 8 and below	12
Grades 7 and below	16	Grades 6 and below	8
Grade 5	4		

48. **Individualized promotion**

Yes	16	No	36
No, but would like to move in that direction			48

49. **Educational technology used in instructional programs**

No educational technology is used	0
Educational television channels/programs only	60
Distance education (remote access w/ technologies	16
Interactive video (remote access)	8
Interactive video (within school)	44
Computer-managed instruction	56
Computer-assisted instruction	84
Other	4

50. **Middle Level Program Characteristics**

	Importance	Current Implementation	Plan for Implementation
Interdisciplinary teams of 2-6 teachers sharing common students, common planning time and housed in close proximity	Little or none ..... 4 Somewhat ..... 12 Very 84	None ..... 4 Partial ..... 24 Full 72	Fully now ..... 68 Fully but will discontinue ..... 8 Do not but definitely plan ..... 0 Do not but considering ..... 12 Do not and do not plan 12
Exploratory course offerings which provide required (not elective) curricular opportunities for all students	Little or none ..... 0 Somewhat ..... 12 Very 88	None ..... 8 Partial ..... 12 Full 80	Fully now ..... 76 Fully but will discontinue ..... 4 Do not but definitely plan ..... 0 Do not but considering ..... 12 Do not and do not plan 8
Advisor-advisee program regularly scheduled for 15 minutes or more during each classroom day	Little or none ..... 4 Somewhat ..... 8 Very 33	None ..... 16 Partial ..... 24 Full 60	Fully now ..... 52 Fully but will discontinue ..... 0 Do not but definitely plan ..... 12 Do not but considering ..... 20 Do not and do not plan 16
Cocurricular program separate from regular graded courses, but occurring during the school day	Little or none ..... 0 Somewhat ..... 36 Very 64	None ..... 16 Partial ..... 48 Full 36	Fully now ..... 44 Fully but will discontinue ..... 0 Do not but definitely plan ..... 8 Do not but considering ..... 24 Do not and do not plan 24
Intramural activities offered for all students during or immediately after the regular classroom day	Little or none ..... 8 Somewhat ..... 8 Very 84	None ..... 4 Partial ..... 52 Full 44	Fully now ..... 44 Fully but will discontinue ..... 0 Do not but definitely plan ..... 8 Do not but considering ..... 20 Do not and do not plan 28

51. **Involvement in professional development activity during past two years**

National professional organization institute or conference (voluntary)	92
State professional organzation activity (voluntary)	96
Activity by private consultants out-of-district (voluntary)	84
District activity required by employment	76
Other voluntary district activities	88
Enrollment in graduate courses (college/university)	40
State department or regional agency activity (voluntary)	72
State department or regional agency activity (required)	24
Principal center or Academy (voluntary)	40
Other	24

52. **Methods by which your teachers have been prepared specifically for middle level**

Inservice program	96	Student/practice teaching at middle level	63
Courses at university	71	Personal study	79
Other	17	No special preparation	4

53. **Three most important skills/characteristics of an "excellent" middle level teacher**

Competence in subject matter knowledge	16
Competence in use of varied and developmentally appropriate methods of instruction	64
Competence in adjusting instruction to the varying learning styles and learning skills of the students	60
Competence in developing a positive relationship with students in the classroom	76
Competence in counseling students	0
Competence in working as a team member	28
Competence in using positive methods for student discipline	4
Competence in promoting positive student self-concept	44
Competence in employee behaviors and work habits (dependability, punctuality, attendance)	0
Competence in working with parents	0
Competence in working with colleagues	4

54. **Rank order of statements according to their relative importance as educational purposes**

	Mean
1) Development of positive self-concept and good human relations	2.08
2) Development of skills and practice in critical intellectual inquiry and problem solving	2.60
3) Acquisition of basic skills (reading, writing, speaking, computing, etc.)	2.88
4) Development of the skills to function in a technological society	5.96
5) Preparation for a changing world	6.12
6) Knowledge about and skills in preparation for family life	6.40
7) Understanding of the American value system	7.12
8) Physical fitness and useful leisure time sports	7.36
9) Development of moral and spiritual values	7.92
10) Appreciation for and experience with the fine arts	8.44
11) Career planning and training in beginning occupational skills	9.20

Appendix C-4

Selected CASE-IMS Data for Restructuring Sample (n-25)

Climate Variable	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
Change Difficulty	2.87	2.87	3.20	2.93	2.87	3.20	3.20	2.80	2.80	2.67	3.07	3.20
Admin. Team	3.64	3.18	4.00	4.27	4.00	4.64	4.13	3.55	3.64	3.64	3.55	4.09
School Goals *	3.60	0.57	1.18	2.21	1.59	1.12	1.28	1.72	2.39	3.37	1.27	2.97
Teacher Satisfaction	3.58	4.06	3.32	3.27	3.98	3.57	3.74	3.56	3.43	3.70	3.39	3.73
Perceived Autonomy *	0.63	0.68	1.76	0.64	1.12	1.29	1.11	1.02	1.33	1.35	1.20	0.99
Perceived Participation	1.32	1.43	0.57	1.68	1.68	1.34	1.29	1.38	0.98	1.27	1.26	1.50
Teacher Climate	**	4.18	3.59	3.84	4.01	3.76	4.06	3.98	3.65	4.18	3.91	4.00
Student Climate	**	4.10	2.94	3.44	3.49	3.60	3.43	3.31	3.24	**	3.24	3.60
Total Achievement	41.26	54.50	51.92	53.14	63.34	**	93.67	57.58	57.26	66.63	64.42	65.38
Student Discipline *	5.00	3.00	8.00	5.00	4.00	8.00	5.00	3.00	8.00	2.00	3.00	5.00
Student Passing	100.00	93.00	99.90	95.00	98.00	88.00	93.00	100.00	98.00	98.00	99.00	95.90
Student Satisfaction	3.56	3.99	2.95	3.26	3.40	3.56	3.34	3.34	3.18	3.38	3.04	3.55
Student Self-Efficacy *	1.87	1.97	1.93	1.70	1.89	1.96	1.91	2.02	2.02	1.94	1.95	1.99
Students Complete Year	1.00	0.58	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.88	1.00	0.52	0.96	0.92	1.00	0.98

M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T	U	V	W	X	Y	NATIONAL NORMS
3.07	3.27	3.07	2.80	3.00	3.07	2.80	2.87	2.93	3.07	2.87	2.80	3.00	3.06
4.00	4.27	4.27	4.45	4.18	3.73	4.00	4.09	3.64	3.73	3.73	4.36	4.36	3.73
1.40	2.81	2.93	1.72	0.94	1.13	1.17	1.59	1.73	2.53	5.46	**	2.75	5.18
3.28	3.58	3.38	3.68	3.66	4.11	2.81	3.06	3.26	3.53	3.82	3.87	3.72	3.23
1.68	0.99	1.35	1.31	0.92	0.64	1.43	1.21	1.47	1.18	0.73	**	1.16	1.37
0.87	1.50	1.20	1.48	1.35	1.82	0.68	0.60	1.05	1.29	1.67	**	1.60	0.85
3.73	3.81	3.71	3.86	3.87	4.44	3.16	3.47	3.90	3.93	4.05	4.26	4.09	3.64
3.20	3.48	3.51	3.45	3.48	3.91	3.33	3.26	3.48	3.47	3.27	3.52	3.41	3.30
52.70	**	52.37	54.46	59.47	**	52.69	**	50.39	45.54	57.78	52.92	56.49	50.00
8.00	8.00	8.00	4.00	6.00	1.00	3.00	8.00	8.00	5.00	2.00	3.00	8.00	3.52
90.00	96.00	92.00	93.00	82.00	99.00	96.00	84.00	90.00	99.00	100.00	93.00	94.00	91.40
3.12	3.43	3.48	3.29	3.17	3.93	3.20	3.16	3.40	3.45	3.27	3.31	3.41	3.27
1.93	2.18	2.01	1.98	1.91	1.83	2.05	1.70	2.06	1.96	1.96	2.22	1.99	2.16
0.95	0.78	1.00	1.00	0.97	1.00	0.96	0.83	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.98	1.00	0.98

* Lower score is more positive

** Data not available

NOTE: Schools A-H are the site-visit schools

Appendix D-1
Letter of Invitation

February 25, 1993

Dear :

It is my pleasure to notify you that the research team for the NASSP National Study of Leadership in Middle Level Education has selected your school for a site visit. From 40 nominated, some 25 schools completed preliminary data gathering for consideration in phase II of the study. Only eight schools have been chosen for visitation.

The criteria used by the research team to select these schools included: 1) CASE-IMS Profiles indicating progress on key variables related to school restructuring; 2) Implementation in the school of significant elements of the middle level model; and 3) Interesting or anomalous school characteristics that may assist educators in understanding restructuring.

In preparation for the site visit, we would ask you to complete the enclosed "School Design Statement". The research team is interested in knowing what elements of school restructuring you have employed in your school. A "School Design Statement" is a set of specifications for a school. On the attached explanation of a "Design Statement", you will note that we have asked you to address 3 Basic and 8 System components. As you respond to these 11 components, it is imperative that you formulate your written responses for the three Basic components **BEFORE** you formulate your written responses for the System components.

You will be contacted soon by the chair of your visitation team to make the arrangements for the visit. Please send two (2) copies of your completed "School Design Statement" to your visitation chair, to arrive at least one week before the scheduled visit.

The research team and NASSP are very excited about the schools we have chosen to visit. We believe that our mutual inquiry will identify important approaches to school restructuring that can be shared with middle level schools everywhere. Thank you for participating.

Sincerely,

James W. Keefe, Ed.D.
Director of Research

0015R-7
Enclosure

Appendix D-2

National Association of Secondary School Principals

SCHOOL DESIGN STATEMENT

(Version 2.0)

BACKGROUND

Peter Senge, in The Fifth Discipline, describes how the design and production of the DC-3, the world's first commercially feasible passenger aircraft depended on the development of five new "component technologies".

- Variable-pitch propeller
- Retractable landing gear
- Light-weight molded body construction
- Radial air-cooled engine, and
- Wing flaps.

All five of these components (systems) were necessary to the success of the project and contributed to the total performance. An earlier design, the Boeing 247, failed because it lacked wing flaps. The plane was unstable on takeoff and landing.

Today, we can design and produce very sophisticated products composed of highly interactive systems, such as automobiles, space craft, and computerized robots. We can design and erect 100+ story buildings. Yet our attempts to improve complex social and political systems have been relatively unsuccessful. We design technology and buildings but have minimal success with health care and city and school renewal.

The time has arrived to apply what we know about designing sophisticated products to redesigning schools. In fact, and with few exceptions, our schools have never been designed. They just happened. The process for designing or redesigning a school, however, is basically the same as the process for designing anything else.

A School Design Statement is a set of specifications for the school you want to have. All components of such a statement must be interdependent and consistent with one another. The total design statement must be comprehensive; i.e. all components of the school necessary for its operation are specified. The design statement provides the direction and focus for the school's planned change process.

The design consists of eleven steps. The first three are basic and must be accomplished, largely at the same time, before the eight system components can be defined. All eleven components are essential to a successfully restructuring school.

Basic Components

1. School mission statement
2. Philosophical, psychological and organizational assumptions about the school
3. Student outcomes statement

System Components

1. Curricula and instructional programs
2. Instructional techniques
3. School structure and organization
4. School culture and climate
5. School leadership, management and budgeting
6. School staffing and staff development
7. School resources, physical plant and equipment
8. Evaluation plan.

DIRECTIONS

On the following pages, please write a brief description of each of these components. Your descriptions or specifications should not exceed one page for each component. The school leadership team or the principal's cabinet should formulate the statement. It is critical that the design team have and use input from:

- Comprehensive assessment (e.g., NASSP's CASE-IMS Profile);
- Literature review of scholars, researchers and futurists;
- Total faculty, representative other staff, students, parents and community members.

National Association of Secondary School Principals

SCHOOL DESIGN STATEMENT

School: _____

Basic Component

1. **Mission Statement.** A relatively brief statement summarizing the purpose of the school. This should be a succinct answer to the question, "Why do we exist as a school?"

2. **Philosophical, Psychological and Organization Assumptions:** A compilation of those assumptions about the nature of learners, learning, motivation, the purposes of schooling, and school organization and budgeting that are considered basic to the school's design. These statements should be compatible with but more detailed than the mission statement. Examples: Students learn best what they select and plan themselves. Learners are all different and have widely varying learning styles. In our school of the future, the basic organizational unit should be the learning team.

3. **Student Outcomes Statement:** A compilation of those 4-6 broad competencies that are seen as essential for student participation in the emerging 21st Century society and economy. These outcomes describe the performance expectations of the school. A well developed outcomes statement is the most effective vision statement for the school. The descriptors form the basis for the school's curriculum and assessment system. Example: Graduates will be complex thinkers, able to use basic and higher order cognitive skills to solve everyday problems, to analyze, plan and manage personal affairs, and to generate successful solutions to demanding challenges.

System Component

1. **Curricula and Instructional Programs:** Short, descriptive paragraphs defining the kinds of curriculum content and learning opportunities that will be offered. These specifications must be consistent with the assumptions and student outcomes statement. The design team should base its specifications on the best in educational research and practice and the recommendations of educational demographers and futurists. Example: The design team prepares a partial listing of the school's curriculum elements; i.e. concepts, processes, issues, skills, and selected content requisite to specified student outcomes. Prerequisite: Literature review or search.

National Association of Secondary School Principals

SCHOOL DESIGN STATEMENT

School: _____

System Component

2. **Instructional Techniques:** Short, descriptive paragraphs defining those teachings techniques chosen by the school because they have been demonstrated successful in accomplishing the desired student outcomes. These techniques must be consistent with the school's philosophical, psychological and organizational assumptions. These specifications should reflect the defined professional role of the teacher and recommended teaching methods and strategies. Examples: Several nationally recognized designs recommend elements of this component; e.g., The Carnegie Council's Turning Points, The Coalition of Essential School's Common Principles, The Learning Environments Consortium's Model of Personalized Education and the University of Wisconsin Restructuring Center's Framework for School Restructuring. (See A Leaders Guide to School Restructuring, NASSP, 1992.)

3. **School Structure and Organization:** A section describing how the school will be structured so that the envisioned student outcomes can be accomplished. The structure of the school must support and facilitate all other components of the design. The section should include descriptors of the desired school schedule and social structure. Key specifications should make clear the nature of learning environments both within and outside the school and teacher planning arrangements. Examples: Block schedules, continuous progress arrangements, interdisciplinary teaching teams, advisor-advisee structure, etc.

4. **School Culture and Climate:** School Culture is defined as "the characteristics, norms, and traditions of a school and its community . . . ." Key characteristics of the school's culture should be defined in this section, to be nurtured in the school. School Climate is defined as "the relatively enduring pattern of shared percentions -- by teachers, students, parents, and community members -- of the characteristics of a school and of its members." Climate is a measure of school culture. Key determinants of the school's climate are also identified and defined in this section. Example: Culture -- customs, traditions, ceremonies and awards that are important to the school, especially in the academic arena; specific norms and expectations of the school related to desired student outcomes. Climate -- specification of climate survey subscales that represent school strengths or point out problems/weaknesses demanding attention (cf. NASSP School Climate Survey).

National Association of Secondary School Principals

SCHOOL DESIGN STATEMENT

School: _____

System Component

5. **School Leadership, Management and Budgeting:** Descriptors defining how the planning, decision-making, and communications processes will be managed. This section may include descriptions of how the school's site-based management will be expected to function. Examples: The functioning of the school leadership team, the school improvement management team (SIMT) or the school design team; the school's decision-making model, particularly if a participative approach is used; school communication processes, including procedures for staff, student and parent/community input into the budget-setting process.

6. **School Staffing and Staff Development:** Descriptors of the primary staff roles, the teacher workplace, teacher hiring and induction policies, and staff development priorities and strategies. The descriptors should address the continuing professional growth of all staff members (growth plans). Examples: Staffing relationships, e.g., faculty (teacher) roles vs. staff roles (everyone else); teacher supervision, professional development and motivation strategies; staff/student participation in teacher hiring.

7. **School Resources, Physical Plant and Equipment:** Descriptors defining the characteristics of the physical plant, the equipment needed to support the envisioned curricular and instructional design, and the coordination of school and community resources, human and fiscal. Examples: Physical facilities like teacher planning rooms or offices and student project areas required by the envisioned programs; types and quantities of equipment needed to support the planned curriculum; available community resources.

8. **Evaluation Plan:** Specifications for the school's evaluation and reporting systems that will inform all members of the school community about existing school and student characteristics and about the extent to which the design is being implemented and the desired student outcomes are being accomplished ("a new accountability"). A comprehensive plan is needed that integrates school context, inputs, processes and outcomes. Examples: Program assessment -- NASSP's CASE-IMS. Teacher performance appraisal -- a developmental or reflective practice model. Student progress and reporting -- authentic and performance assessment reported by contract, criteria, anecdotally, or by exhibitions and portfolios.

NASSP Middle Level Study
On-Site Schedule

<table>
<tr><th></th><th>DAY I</th><th>DAY II</th><th>DAY III</th></tr>
<tr><td>MORNING</td><td>Principal
(a) Tour
(b) Review Schedule
(c) Background Data
(d) Review Protocols:
(1) Lead. Team Interview
(2) Teacher Interview
(3) Student Interview
(4) Student Shadow
(e) Open Dialogue
(f) Interpret CASE-IMS Data</td><td>STUDENT INTERVIEW
STUDENT SHADOW
Minimum:
4 periods
plus lunch
CLASS OBSERVATION
Minimum:
2 observations
30 min. each</td><td>FOLLOW-UP
AND WRITING
AS APPROPRIATE</td></tr>
<tr><td>AFTER-NOON</td><td>Class Observations
Minimum:
2 observations
30 minutes each</td><td></td><td>TRAVEL</td></tr>
<tr><td>AFTER-SCHOOL</td><td>LEADERSHIP
TEAM INTERVIEW</td><td>TEACHERS
INTERVIEW</td><td></td></tr>
</table>

Site Visitation Team Members

Team A

Donald C. Clark, professor, University of Arizona, Tucson

Mary Scheetz, principal, Orange Grove Middle School, Tucson, AZ

Team B

Judith L. Irvin, associate professor, Florida State University, Tallahassee

Marion Payne, principal, Mount View Middle School, Marriottsville, MD

Team C

James W. Keefe, director of research, NASSP, Reston, VA

Laurel M. Kanthak, director of middle level education, NASSP, Reston, VA

Team D

Jerry Valentine, professor, University of Missouri, Columbia

Todd C. Whitaker, middle school coordinator, board of education, Jefferson, City, MO.

National Study of Leadership in Middle Level Education
Phase II: Leadership in Restructuring Schools
General Background Information Data Form

School:_____ **Date:**_____

Directions: In the morning session of Day I, engage the principal in conversation that will assist our understanding of general issues such as the evolution of the school, the competencies of the staff, the characteristics of the community and students served, and the relationships between the school's facilities and the educational programs of the school. This is simply background data to assist in understanding the context of responses and to provide any anecdotal information to be used in the description of the school in the introductory section of the report. A place to record information about each issue is provided below. The order and manner with which you obtain the information is up to you. Simply record that information which you believe is pertinent.

History/Background of the School

Staff

Students

Community

Facilities (particularly aspects that might enhance or detract from certain types of instructional programs. Also, unusual facilities not commonly found in a middle level school)

Researcher reminder:
Remember to obtain from the principal copies of school materials that will enhance the our understanding of the school. Obtain 3 copies of the school master schedule and, if available, 3 copies of the student handbook and a copy of the teacher handbook. Collect these and any other materials about the students, staff or school that would be appropriate.

National Study of Leadership in Middle Level Education
Phase II: Leadership in Restructuring Schools
Leadership Team Interview Data Collection Form

School:_____ Date:_____ Time:_____
Number in Group:_____ Male:____ Female:____
Job Positions of each member: _____
_____
Interviewers: _____

Directions:
1. Participants should be only those persons identified by the principal in accord with the directions sent to the principal prior to the visit. Confirm the selections during your opening morning session with the principal or before arriving at the school. Refer to your copy of the "Directions for the Selection of Leadership Team Interview Participants" if you have any concerns about the selection process. Participants should be only those persons identified by the principal as members of the school's "leadership team."
2. Plan ahead and try to check-out the interview room with the principal to be sure it is appropriate for effective, relaxed communication.
3. The research team member should begin the interview session by explaining the background and purpose of the on-site visit and the basic purpose of this interview. In essence, that purpose if to obtain insight from the team about restructuring in this particular school. Be cautious in this introduction--let's not establish biases of any nature before we begin the interview.
4. Conclude the opening comments with an encouragement that all participants share their thoughts on the issues, whether those thoughts are similar or different. After responses, make eye contact with each person to be sure they have had a chance to contribute if they wish to do so. This eye contact also helps to understand if they affirm what has been said or appear to differ and you need to probe a little with them. We want to understand what these teachers are thinking and perceiving.
5. If you feel it expedites, and improves the quality of the discussion, you might wish to hand to the participants the list of questions. If you do so, share only the page with the questions currently being discussed.
6. If both interviewers take notes, please combine the data onto one interview form so the writers have the compiled information on one form.

1.0 Representative visions for restructuring in developmentally appropriate middle level schools. (Researcher use only-do not ask this as a question.)

Interview Items:

1.1 Describe your (personal) vision of developmentally appropriate schooling for young adolescents.

1.1.1 How did you arrive at this vision?

1.2 Describe the vision that informed this school 5 years ago.

1.2.1 How did you arrive at this vision?

1.3 Describe the current vision for this school.

1.3.1 How did you arrive at this vision?

1.4 Think about this school in 5 years. Would you change the current vision?

1.4.1 If so, in what way?

1.4.2 How did you arrive at that vision?

1.5 In light of this discussion and reflection, would you change the current vision that your school recently mailed to us?

1.6 What evidence do you have that the parents and community support the current vision?

1.7 What evidence do you have that the administrators and teachers of the school support the current vision?

1.8 What evidence do you have that the students of the school support the current vision?

2.0 Philosophical, psychological and organizational assumptions behind your restructuring program? (Researcher use only-do not ask this as a question.)

Interview Items:

2.1 Talk for a few minutes about the 3 to 5 assumptions most important to your school.

2.1.1 How did you arrive at these assumptions?

2.2 How have these assumptions driven the planning for restructuring the school?

2.3 How widely are the assumptions shared in the school?

2.3.1 What evidence do you have to support this response?

2.4 How widely are the assumptions shared in the community?

2.4.1 What evidence do you have to support this response?

2.5 How does the school deal with opposition to these assumptions?

2.5.1 What evidence do you have to support this response?

2.6 Are these assumptions different now than they were 5 years ago?

2.6.1 What evidence do you have to support this response?

2.7 Are the current assumptions likely to change in the next five years?

2.7.1 What evidence do you have to support this response?

3.0 Desired student outcomes for restructuring middle level schools. (Researcher use only-do not ask this as a question.)

Interview Items:

3.1 Discuss the desired student outcomes for this school.

3.2 How did you identify these outcomes?

3.3 How do you know these are appropriate outcomes for your school?

3.4 How will you know that students have achieved these outcomes?

3.5 What evidence do you have that administrators and teachers support these outcomes?

3.6 What evidence do you have that parents and community support these outcomes?

3.7 What evidence do you have that students support these outcomes?

4.0 Processes middle level schools have used to achieve developmentally appropriate restructuring. (Researcher use only-do not ask this as a question)

Interview Items:

4.1 Did you consciously determine that restructuring was appropriate for this school?

4.1.1 How was this determination made?

4.1.2 Who was involved in determining that restructuring was appropriate for this school?

4.2 What processes are being used in this school to achieve developmentally appropriate restructuring?

4.2.1 How did you decide on these processes?

4.2.2 Who was involved in the decision?

4.3 Is the process for restructuring written as policy or in any manner formally or informally approved or endorsed?

4.3.1 If so, by whom was it written?

4.3.2 If so, by whom was it approved or endorsed?

4.4 What strategies were used for implementation of restructuring in this school?

4.5 What evidence do you have that restructuring is being successful in this school?

National Study of Leadership in Middle Level Education
Phase II: Leadership in Restructuring Schools
Teacher Interview Data Collection Form

School:_____ Date:_____ Time:_____
Number in Group:_____ Male:____ Female:____
Job Positions of each member:_____
_____
Interviewers: _____

Directions:

1. Participants should be only those persons identified by the principal in accord with the directions sent to the principal prior to the visit. Confirm the selections during your opening morning session with the principal or before arriving at the school. Refer to your copy of the "Directions for the Selection of Teachers for Teacher Interview" if you have any concerns about the selection process. The grade patterns of the on-site schools are 6-7-8, 7-8 or 7-8-9. The following job choices were designed to fit those grade patterns. You should have seven teachers, a counselor and a librarian in the interview. These should be full-time teachers in that school and none of them should have participated in the Leadership Team Interview.

    English/Language Arts teacher Grade 6 or Grade 9
    Math teacher Grade 6 or Grade 9
    Social Studies Teacher Grade 7
    Science Teacher Grade 8
    Physical Education Teacher Grade 8
    Fine Arts Exploratory Teacher Grade 7
    Practical, Vocational or Technical Teacher Grade 7
    Counselor (first on an alphabetic list)
    Librarian/Media Specialist (first on an alphabetic list)

2. Plan ahead and try to check-out the interview room with the principal to be sure it is appropriate for effective, relaxed communication.
3. The research team member should begin the interview session by explaining the background and purpose of the on-site visit and the basic purpose of this interview. In essence, that purpose if to obtain insight from the teachers about restructuring in this particular school. Be cautious in this introduction--let's not establish biases of any nature before we begin the interview.
4. Conclude the opening comments with an encouragement that all participants share their thoughts on the issues, whether those thoughts are similar or different. After responses, make eye contact with each person to be sure they have had a chance to contribute if they wish to do so. This eye contact also helps to understand if they affirm what has been said or appear to differ and you need to probe a little with them. We want to understand what these teachers are thinking and perceiving.
5. If the you feel it expedites, and improves the quality of the discussion, you might wish to hand to the teachers the list of questions. If you do so, share only the page with the questions currently being discussed.
6. If both interviewers take notes, please combine the data onto one interview form so the writers have the compiled information on one form.

1.0 Representative visions for restructuring in developmentally appropriate middle level schools. (Researcher use only-do not ask this as a question.)

Interview Items:

1.1 Describe your (personal) vision of developmentally appropriate schooling for young adolescents.

1.1.1 How did you arrive at this vision?

1.2 Describe the vision that informed this school 5 years ago.

1.2.1 How did you arrive at this vision?

1.3 Describe the current vision for this school.

1.3.1 How did you (your school) arrive at this vision?

1.4 Think about this school in 5 years. Would you change the current vision?

1.4.1 If so, in what way?

1.4.2 How did you arrive at that vision?

1.5 In light of this discussion and reflection, would you change the current vision that your principal recently mailed to us? (Researcher may need to explain)

1.6 What evidence do you have that the parents and community support the current vision?

1.7 What evidence do you have that the administrators and teachers of the school support the current vision?

1.8 What evidence do you have that the students of the school support the current vision?

2.0 Philosophical, psychological and organizational assumptions behind your restructuring program? (Researcher use only-do not ask this as a question.)

Interview Items:

2.1 Talk for a few minutes about the 3 to 5 assumptions most important to your school.

2.1.1 How did you arrive at these assumptions?

2.2 How have these assumptions driven the planning for restructuring the school?

2.3 How widely are the assumptions shared in the school?

2.3.1 What evidence do you have to support this response?

2.4 How widely are the assumptions shared in the community?

2.4.1 What evidence do you have to support this response?

2.5 How does the school deal with opposition to these assumptions?

2.5.1 What evidence do you have to support this response?

2.6 Are these assumptions different now than they were 5 years ago?

2.6.1 What evidence do you have to support this response?

2.7 Are the current assumptions likely to change in the next five years?

2.7.1 What evidence do you have to support this response?

3.0 Desired student outcomes for restructuring middle level schools. (Researcher use only-do not ask this as a question.)

Interview Items:

3.1 Discuss the desired student outcomes for this school.

3.2 How did you identify these outcomes?

3.3 How do you know these are appropriate outcomes for your school?

3.4 How will you know that students have achieved these outcomes?

3.5 What evidence do you have that administrators and teachers support these outcomes?

3.6 What evidence do you have that parents and community support these outcomes?

3.7 What evidence do you have that students support these outcomes?

4.0 Processes middle level schools have used to achieve developmentally appropriate restructuring. (Researcher use only-do not ask this as a question)

Interview Items:

4.1 Did you consciously determine that restructuring was appropriate for this school?

4.1.1 How was this determination made?

4.1.2 Who was involved in determining that restructuring was appropriate for this school?

4.2 What processes are being used in this school to achieve developmentally appropriate restructuring?

4.2.1 How did you decide on these processes?

4.2.2 Who was involved in the decision?

4.3 Is the process for restructuring written as policy or in any manner formally or informally approved or endorsed?

4.3.1 If so, by whom was it written?

4.3.2 If so, by whom was it approved or endorsed?

4.4 What strategies were used for implementation of restructuring in this school?

4.5 What evidence do you have that restructuring is being successful in this school?

National Study of Leadership in Middle Level Education
Phase II: Leadership in Restructuring Schools
Student Interview Data Collection Form

School:_____ Date:_____ Time:_____
Number in Group by Sex:_____ By Ethnicity:_____
Interviewers: _____

Directions for Student Interview Selection

Please use the following process to identify a total of six students for the student interview. Complete this selection process on the Day I of the visit so the students will know they will miss the first hour or so of classes on Day II of the visit.

1. Ask the principal to identify one student from each grade who is considered a student leader. This should be a class president or a similar leadership position if possible. In the 6-7 8 and 7-8-9 schools, that will be three students. In the 7-8 schools, ask the principal to identify two eighth grade students leaders. You now have the names of three students identified by the principal.

2. With the help of the principal or a counselor to show you where the student comprehensive file folders are located for each grade, pull the folders for the students identified by the principal. Record their name, grade, sex and ethnicity on a separate page, not on the Student Interview Form. Listing these facts will assure representativeness of students, help with the identification of the students when they arrive for the interview and confirm you have the correct students in the interview.

3. Again, with the assistance of the principal or counselor to be sure you are using the correct files, select at random a student file from each grade. If the student you select is not of the opposite sex as the student leader identified by the principal (in procedure #1 above), make another selection until you have randomly selected a student of the opposite sex. In the 7-8 schools, select an additional seventh grade student, making sure that student is of the opposite sex from the second eighth grade student selected by the principal.

4. At this point you should have six student files. You have three files representing the principals choices of student leaders and three representing your random choices. In the 6-7-8 and 7-8-9 schools you have two files from each grade. In the 7-8 schools, you have three files from each grade. You should have three females and three males. The final issues to consider is ethnicity. Obtain from the principal or counselor the approximate percentage of students in the school by ethnic origin. Review your six file folders to determine if they are a fair representation of those percentages. If not, determine what changes you need to make. (For your calculation convenience, 1/6 is 17%; 2/6 is 33%, etc.) Use the following process to make ethnic changes:

a. Begin by altering the randomly selected students. Note the grade and sex of the student you need to replace and make random selections from the files until you have a replacement of the same grade and sex that fits your ethnic need.

b. If you need to change more students than those randomly selected, ask the principal to identify different student leaders in order to provide the appropriate ethnic representation. Do not alter the principals selections if you can make the necessary changes from your random students.

5. Confirm that the six students selected are in school the day of the interview. If a student must be replaced, remember to replace the student with another of the same grade, sex and ethnicity.

6. If the school does not have comprehensive file folders from which to make selections, use a student roster, a student card file or other suitable listing of students by grade.

7. Finalize your list of six students and the groups they represent.

Directions for Conducting Interview:

1. Participants should be only those persons identified by the above described process.

2. Plan ahead and try to check-out the interview room with the principal to be sure it is appropriate for effective, relaxed communication.

3. The research team member should begin the interview session by explaining the background and purpose of the on-site visit and the basic purpose of this interview. In essence, that purpose if to obtain insight from students about their school. Be cautious in this introduction--let's not establish biases of any nature before we begin the interview.

4. Conclude the opening comments with an encouragement that all participants share their thoughts on the issues, whether those thoughts are similar or different. After responses, make eye contact with each person to be sure they have had a chance to contribute if they wish to do so. This eye contact also helps to understand if they affirm what has been said or appear to differ and you need to probe a little with them. We want to understand what these students are thinking and perceiving.

5. If both interviewers take notes, please combine the data onto one interview form so the writers have the compiled information on one form.

1. What does the principal of this school do?

   What is his/her name?

   Does he/she know your name?

   Do you ever talk to the principal?

   If so, what about?

2. Do students have a voice in making decisions, such as establishing rules and recommending courses or activities to be offered?

   How does this happen?

3. Do you have opportunities here at school to explore topics or questions that interest you personally?

   Give an example.

   What would you do if there were some topic you wanted to learn more about?

4. Do you think the teachers and staff members encourage students to initiate and follow-through on ideas and activities?

Do your teachers encourage you to ask questions?

Are people here interested in what you think?

Would you say that imagination is rewarded or discouraged in this school?

Please explain.

5. Is there an adult here at school whom you talk to when you want advice on classes?

When you want advice on career or educational plans?

When you want advice or just someone to talk to about personal concerns or problems?

Do you think this statement is true or false: "Almost every student at this school has at least one adult staff member with whom he/she has a close supportive relationship?"

6. Do students fear for their physical safety while at school?

Are you willing to walk alone in the halls?

Are you willing to go alone to the bathroom?

Do you worry a lot about getting beaten up, having things stolen from you or being harmed by someone else here at school?

Explain why or why not.

7. Do you feel that you can express ideas, concerns, and beliefs without being embarrassed or ridiculed by someone else here at school?

Why or why not?

Do you understand what is expected of you at this school?

How is that communicated?

How is that communicated to your parents?

8. How much do you think adults here care about you?

Please explain.

Do teachers talk to you about things you have done well?

Do teachers talk to you about things you are interested in outside the classroom?

When do teachers talk to you?

9. Do you like this school?

Why or why not?

What is best about this school?

What changes would you like to see in this school?

Who should make those changes?

10. What is the purpose of this school?

11. What are the two most important things this school stands for?

12. As students, what about this school are you most proud of?

13. Is there anything that we have not talked about that you would like to share that would help us understand how you feel about your school?

National Study of Leadership in Middle Level Education
Phase II: Leadership in Restructuring Schools
Classroom Observation Data Form

School:_____
Course/class:_____ **# of Students:**____
Directions:

Please document some of the general teaching practices used in the school. Please make at least four thirty-minute-or-more observations during your three days at the school. Please attempt to make two of those observations on the afternoon of day one (one by each researcher) and two observations during day two (both by the researcher who is not shadowing a student). Please observe two "core" and two "explo" classes. During or after each observation, please complete a copy of this form.

Also, please ask the teacher to complete the Post Classroom Observation Teacher Form and return the form to you by the morning of Day III. This will provide four observations and teacher comments directly related to curricular and instructional issues.

Additional classroom observations are encouraged during the two days. Numerous classroom visits of shorter duration may provide valuable insight about the curriculum and instruction in the school. Feel free to summarize other visits on a single copy of this form. If you do so, please note that it is a summary and indicate the approximate number and length of observations that the summary represents.

Please review and respond to the following "look-fors" when recording data about your classroom visits.

1. **Classroom Atmosphere** (Did you see evidence of: physical arrangement of classroom, student work, student or teacher focus, acceptance, comfortableness, warmth?)

2. **Teacher-student interaction** (Did you see evidence of: teacher learning with students, student choices in curriculum, student choices in activities, counseling behaviors, active listening skills, positive-negative interactions, pupil management/control system, , ratio of teacher/student talk, direct teacher behavior/indirect behaviors?)

3. **Student/student interaction** (Did you see evidence of: student movement about the room, cooperative learning, active engagement in learning, comfortableness with one another?)

4. **Curriculum** (Did you see evidence of: learning centers, problem solving and creative thinking activities, application of knowledge, connection of content to other courses, relevance of content to students, emphasis on process rather than product such as learning to write vs writing a report, student input into what they had to learn?)

5. **Instruction** (Did you see evidence of: student involvement in lesson, varied instructional methods/strategies, hands-on learning, active teaching, cooperative learning?)

6. Assessment (Did you see evidence of: varied assessment/evaluation/grading practices?)

7. Materials (Did you see evidence of: multi-materials approaches, technology, hands-on materials, workbooks/workbook sheets, resources?)

8. Additional Data: Please record any additional data that would be of help in understanding the curricular and instructional processes used in this school.

National Study of Leadership in Middle Level Education
Phase II: Leadership in Restructuring Schools
Post-Observation Teacher Form

A word of explanation about our classroom visits:
As a part of the on-site visit to your school, our research team members have visited many classrooms. When we have had time time to visit a class at length, we have made some notes about class atmosphere, teaching methodology, student-teacher interactions, curriculum, etc. It is not our purpose to evaluate teaching in this school. We are simply noting some of these types of issues in order to enrich our understanding of the practices used in restructuring schools. We appreciate your patience with us as we have moved about the school to follow students and observe the teaching learning process. Your willingness to share your school with us makes possible research that contributes to quality education. Thank You!

Please respond to the following:
You have been given this page by a member of the research team. Please take a moment to respond to the brief questions and return the page to the research team member by the morning of the third day of the visit. Thank you for your assistance.

1. How are students assigned to your classes? How often do those assignments change?

2. How did the lesson we observed today "fit" with previous and future lessons?

3. How does that lesson "fit" with the goals of the school?

4. How is the curriculum you teach determined? How much input do you have? How much are students involved in planning the curriculum you teach?

5. How long have you been teaching? In what ways has your teaching changed in the past five years?

6. How are students assessed in your classes?

7. How do you communicate with your students' parents?

Thank you! Please return this page to the research team member.

National Study of Leadership in Middle Level Education
Phase II: Leadership in Restructuring Schools
Student Shadow Form

School:_____ Date:_____ Time:_____
Student Grade:_____Sex:_____ Ethnicity:_____
Shadower: _____

Directions for Student Selection

1. Select a student from grade 7. We are using grade seven because it represents the middle grade of middle level education (grades 5-9) and because each of the on-site visitation schools has a grade 7. That may provide some opportunity for contrast among schools.

2. The process for student selection is the same as for the randomly selected students to be interviewed. With the assistance of the principal or counselor, to be sure you are using the correct files, select at random a student file for a seventh grader.

3. Review the schedule of the student with the counselor or principal. If this student spends 25% or more of his/her day in special education classes, select another student.

4. Check attendance to be sure the student is in school that day.

5. Record, for the four classes you plan to observe, the student's schedule on the Shadow Study Schedule Sheet.

Directions for Data Collection

1. Begin the student shadow as soon as feasible after the student interview on the morning of Day II. Locate the student's next regularly scheduled class and go to that room a couple of minutes before starting time. With the help of the teacher, unobtrusively identify the student to be shadowed. Find a seat in the back of the room and begin observing.

2. Shadow the student for four classroom periods and the lunch period.

3. Using the forms provided, record the information requested on the form. While you cannot be oblivious to other matters, try to keep your focus on the individual student and what he/she is apparently doing.

4. The 5 to 7 minute time interval will give you a bit of flexibility, but will definitely show the flow of actions and activities. Start a new time interval with each change of class or period. Go with the student to the gym, lunch, and as nearly as possible, keep up with the individual so you can experience vicariously his/her day for the four periods you are shadowing.

5. At the end of the day, record your impressions on the bottom half of the Shadow Study Schedule Sheet.

NASSP STUDY OF MIDDLE LEVEL LEADERSHIP

Shadow Study Schedule Sheet

Student Information: Female ____ Male____ Grade ____

Room	Time	Course

Observer's Reactions

Having spent four periods observing a student, some of my reactions, feelings, and judgments are:

NASSP STUDY OF MIDDLE LEVEL LEADERSHIP - SHADOW STUDY FIELD NOTES

(Record your observations every 5 to 7 minutes in the appropriate columns)

Time	Specific Student Behavior at 5 to 7 Minute Intervals	Instructional Method	Comments